

Abstract

This thesis is focused on the function and distribution of the preposition *dla* and *dlja* in Polish and Russian in translations taken from the bilingual section of the Russian National Corpus (both in translations from Polish to Russian and from Russian to Polish). I selected instances in which, within the same lexical and syntactic context, the preposition occurs in either language but not in the other and analysed the alternative linguistic forms found in competition with *dla/dlja*. After identifying the semantic roles introduced by the preposition in each sample, I defined the semantic values and field of application of each competing form, simple dative or other prepositions, taken into account. On the basis of the Cognitive Linguistics conceptual framework, I finally contextualized and explained the linguistic means found in opposition with *dla/dlja* with the help of other online corpora and resources to reveal the multiple meanings that the preposition can convey in Russian and Polish.

L'argomento di questa tesi è la funzione e distribuzione della preposizione *dla* e *dlja* in polacco e russo in traduzioni tratte dalla sezione bilingue del Russian National Corpus (traduzioni dal polacco al russo e dal russo al polacco). Ho selezionato occorrenze in cui, nello stesso contesto sintattico e lessicale, la preposizione compare in una delle due lingue ma non nell'altra e ho analizzato le forme linguistiche alternative trovate in competizione con *dla/dlja*. Dopo aver individuato i ruoli semantici introdotti dalla preposizione in ognuna delle occorrenze, ho identificato i valori semantici e il campo di applicazione di ogni forma concorrente, dativo semplice o altra preposizione, presa in considerazione. Sulla base dell'apparato concettuale della Linguistica Cognitiva, ho infine contestualizzato e spiegato i mezzi linguistici trovati in contrapposizione con *dla/dlja* con l'ausilio di altri corpora e risorse online per rivelare i molteplici significati che la preposizione può assumere in russo e in polacco.

Contents

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Case systems and prepositions in Russian and Polish	5
3.	The preposition <i>dla/dlja</i> : history and functions, a general overview.....	16
3.1	Distribution of <i>dla/dlja</i> in the Slavic languages	16
3.2	Short history and development of <i>dla/dlja</i>	18
3.3	Contexts and meanings in the current use of <i>dla/dlja</i>	21
4.	The Corpus: collection parameters and research methodology	30
4.1	The Russian National Corpus (RNC).....	30
4.2	Data collection	32
5.	The Corpus: classification and analysis of the samples	41
5.1	Presentation and classification of the data	41
5.2	Simple dative	43
5.3	Other prepositions.....	51
5.4	Final overview.....	70
6.	Conclusions from the point of view of Cognitive Linguistics	73
7.	Appendix.....	84
Polish <i>dla</i> – Russian simple dative	84	
Russian <i>dlja</i> – Polish simple dative	94	
Polish <i>dla</i> – other Russian prepositions.....	96	
Russian <i>dlja</i> - other Polish prepositions.....	101	
8.	Bibliography.....	106

1. Introduction

This thesis is focused on the function and distribution of the Polish preposition *dla* and the corresponding Russian preposition *dlja*, roughly translatable with ‘for’ in English, in journalistic and literary translations taken from the bilingual section of the Russian National Corpus (both in translations from Polish to Russian and from Russian to Polish). More specifically, I searched and analysed instances in which, within the same lexical and syntactic context, the preposition occurs in either language but not in the other, where it is replaced by other constructions instead, such as a simple case or another preposition. I call these alternative means “competing forms” or “competing constructions” throughout this essay because, as the word suggest, they are found in competition with the preposition *dla/ dlja* in the same linguistic environment. The results obtained through this empirical research have been interpreted within the Cognitive Linguistics conceptual framework in order to investigate the polysemic value of cases and prepositions in these two fusional Slavic languages and the interchangeability, overlapping and relations among the different linguistic elements retrieved.

As we will see, among the Slavic languages only the East branch of the family, which includes Russian, Belarussian and Ukrainian, along with Polish, belonging to the West branch, features this preposition. This is the main reason why I decided to choose precisely these two languages for my study, besides the fact that data from Russian and Polish are more easily available.

In Chapter 2 of this essay, I will give a very general and simplified overview of the case systems and prepositions in contemporary Polish and Russian, their functions and their uses, based on grammar textbooks and articles. This first part is not meant to be a complete and exhaustive

grammar dissertation, but rather an introduction to the morphological and syntactical skeleton of the two languages in order to make the understanding of the following contents easier.

I will then briefly introduce the preposition under investigation, drawing on etymology and other diachronic information, even though this work is substantially a synchronic analysis and is focused only on the language used from the 1920s, that is, after the Russian linguistic and orthographic reform that took place in 1918. In this chapter, I will also introduce the application fields of the preposition *dla/ dlja* both in Russian and Polish, while describing its meanings and the contexts in which it is used.

In the central part of my work, I will discuss in detail the methodology and the search parameters I have followed to collect the examples of my corpus, how I set up a sub-corpus with the insertion of filters to make an initial selection of the hundreds of results I first encountered, which criteria I adopted to visualize and choose the example to be translated, classified and analysed at a later time, how and why I discarded some instances rather than others. It is crucial to highlight not only the merits of the corpus I based my research on, but also and especially its limits, in order to clearly define the extent of the empirical ground on which I obtained my sources and provide useful information for possible future researches on this subject.

This chapter will be followed by a detailed analysis of the corpus samples, with hit counts of the linguistic means used as an alternative to the preposition *dla/ dlja* both in Russian and Polish language, observation of patterns and regularities and possible explanations. This section will be backed and supported by additional empirical examples found in the much larger and more diastatically and diaphasically varied Sketch Engine corpus for Polish, Polish Web 2019 (plTenTen19) and Russian, Russian Web 2017 (ruTenTen17) and other online resources, especially with regard to the prepositions found in opposition with *dla/ dlja*.

As we will see in much greater detail in the analysis section of this thesis, in Chapter 5, as far as Russian is concerned, an overwhelming majority of the competing constructions of the Polish

preposition *dla* consists in the simple dative, without preposition. In these cases, the referent is typically animate, human and very often covers the semantic role of experiencer or *iudicantis*, whereas in Polish the simple dative seems to be less common in these same contexts. In Polish, on the other hand, we find more often a diversified range of prepositions used as an alternative to Russian *dlja*, especially prototypical spatial prepositions such as *na* or *do* and when the prepositional phrase has the meaning of purpose and the referent is therefore inanimate.

In Chapter 6 of this study, I will draw conclusions on the overlapping and alternation of the linguistic elements, cases and prepositions, found in competition with the preposition *dla/dlja*. In particular, I will examine the metaphorical geometrical relations that justify the choice of these strategies to express the same semantic values of the preposition *dla/ dlja* on the basis of the spatial concepts and cognitive categorizations that have been theorized by Cognitive Linguistics researchers in analogous situations.

As Cognitive Linguistics has shown, as a matter of fact, every aspect and item of human language is embodied in our concrete, everyday experience. This principle applies not only to prototypical lexical items, such as nouns that refer to very concrete, recognizable *denotata*, but also to the most grammatical items, such as prepositions and cases, which cover functional roles and are not attributable to precise physical objects. Therefore, to a certain extent, the communicative strategies that are adopted in different languages can be justified through the understanding of universal cognitive operations such as metaphorical thinking, analogies and associations on imaginary spatial fields. In the last chapter of this essay, I will attempt to explain the competing forms that have been found and analysed in my corpus in light of these theories.

For greater transparency, the portions of texts that I have collected from the Russian-Polish parallel Russian National Corpus, with their literal translations and classification, as well as the counts of the occurrences, are fully available in the Appendix at the end of the essay. All the examples reported and analysed in this paper are either obtained and faithfully copied from existing corpora or online translators, with their references and exact day or period of retrieval in footnote, or created

specifically to illustrate the concept under examination and then cross-checked through online resources, like grammar articles, translators and dictionaries when needed, in order to exclude any possibility of error. The date of retrieval is particularly important in case of data obtained online because the web is constantly updating and expanding, therefore the information that was available at the time of the research may no longer be accessible at a later point or may be different because of subsequent adjustments and modifications.

2. Case systems and prepositions in Russian and Polish

The Slavic languages feature a rather complex and articulated nominal case system, with only two notable exceptions, Bulgarian and Macedonian of the South Slavic branch.

As a matter of fact, in Russian we count six nominal cases, which are conventionally called nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, instrumental and prepositional. In Polish we find the same situation, with the same number of nominal cases: nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, instrumental and locative. The Russian prepositional case, so named because it can occur only after a preposition, matches the Polish locative case, as we find them in the same semantic contexts after the same prepositions, especially after spatial prepositions like Polish and Russian *na* or Polish *w* and Russian *v* to express static locative meanings. Even the suffixes of the Russian prepositional and Polish locative, both in the singular and plural forms and for all three genders, are recognizable as the same morphemes, with very few and minor phonetical variations between the two languages. Their differentiation is thus more a matter of conventional denomination, derived by the Russian descriptive grammar tradition, than a real morphological discrepancy. As far as Polish is concerned, grammarians add an external case to the six listed before, the vocative, that has a very restricted application, is used only with feminine and masculine singular nouns of persons and, according to recent studies, is being gradually replaced by the nominative case.

Except for the instable vocative, we can therefore assert that there is a significant correspondence between the Russian and the Polish cases, which reveals their close linguistic kinship due to a relatively recent common proto-language, namely reconstructed and, so far, not directly

attested Proto-Slavic, in spite of their belonging to different Slavic branches (the East branch and the West branch, respectively).

The presence of a robust inflectional apparatus in these two highly fusional languages does not certainly prevent them from displaying a rich repertoire of prepositions as well, which can be associated with one or more above-mentioned cases.

Both Russian and Polish have primary prepositions, secondary prepositions (which are forms of nouns, adverbs or other more lexicalized items possessing their own autonomous semantic significance as well, such as Polish *blisko*, ‘near’, or Russian *vnutri*, ‘inside’) and more complex and linguistically heavier prepositional constructions, often built by combining one or more grammatical elements with one or more lexical elements (such as nouns or adverbs) like, for instance, Polish *w pobliżu* + genitive, that can be literally translated with ‘in (the) vicinity of’ or Russian *vo vremja* + genitive, literally ‘in (the) time of’, ‘during’.

In his study on analytic tendencies in contemporary Russian and Polish, Sosnowski (2011:105) claims that the use of secondary prepositions and prepositional combinations is gradually increasing in the most recent productions. This phenomenon, accompanied by the simplification and/or impoverishment of inflectional forms in both languages, is supposedly a clear sign that Russian and Polish are undergoing a process of gradual transformation into more analytic languages, which rely more heavily on separated lexical units to express grammatical categories at the expense of progressively more obsolete synthetic inflectional forms.

Since the present thesis will focus on the primary preposition *dla/ dlja*, however, I will now leave aside the secondary prepositions and prepositional combinations and examine in more detail the primary prepositions found in the two languages in question. It is important to note that the translations of prepositions that I provide here out of context are necessarily approximate and vague, since prepositions are polysemous, like all items of language to varying degrees, and tend to be less semantically determined compared to nouns or verbs. Therefore, they often have different extensions

and sets of uses in different languages and may be translated very differently in different linguistic contexts.

According to Švédova et al. (1980), the primary prepositions in Russian are 24. Most of them, 15, require only one case, whereas the others may appear with two or more cases to signal a difference in meaning. In Polish the situation is quite similar, as Bartnicka et al. (2004) identify 17 primary prepositions, among which eight can assign only one case to the corresponding noun and the others can be used with two or more cases depending on the context.

Among the prepositions that assign only one case in both languages, we find the preposition that will be examined later in this essay, Polish *dla* and Russian *dlja*, meaning ‘for’, which requires the genitive case in both languages; Polish and Russian *bez*, with the genitive, meaning ‘without’; Polish and Russian *do* with genitive again, meaning ‘to’, ‘up to’; Polish *ku* and Russian *k*, ‘towards’, with the dative in both languages; Polish *od* and Russian *ot*, ‘from’, ‘away’, often introducing cause in Russian and comparison in Polish, with the genitive; Polish *przy* and Russian *pri*, ‘next to’, ‘at’, with the locative/prepositional case; Polish and Russian *u*, also meaning ‘at’, ‘by’, followed by genitive. In addition to them, Bartnicka et al. mention the preposition *przez*, ‘through’, for Polish and Švédova et al. the prepositions *iz*, ‘out of’, *krome*, ‘except from’, *nad*, ‘above’, *pered* and *pred* ‘in front of’, ‘before’, *radi*, ‘for’ but with a more specific application than *dlja*, as we will see later, *čerez*, ‘over’, ‘through’.

Among the prepositions that can be followed by more than one case, the most well-known and studied in language classes as well as in linguistic dissertations are certainly the spatial prepositions, like the already mentioned Polish and Russian *na* and Polish *w* and Russian *v*, which introduce a static spatial argument with the locative/prepositional case and a dynamic spatial argument with the accusative case. The main difference between these two prepositions is that, in the case of *na*, the space is conceived as a surface or, more generally, as an open space and the preposition is typically translated in English with the prepositions ‘at’, ‘by’ or ‘to’ in case of motion towards, whereas with *w/ v* the space is seen as a closed area and the preposition is mostly translated with the

expressions ‘in’, inside of’. It is possible that the very same physical space is considered either an open or a closed area in different languages or even in the same language by different speakers or in different semantic environments. We can analyse few simple examples here below to see how it works in practice:

(1) *я хожу в университет* (Russian)

Ja chožu v universitet

PRON.1SG go.PRS.1SG in university.ACC.SG

‘I go to (the) university’

(2) *я работаю в университет-е* (Russian)

Ja rabota-ju v universitet-e

PRON.1SG work.PRS.1SG in university-PREP.SG

‘I work in (the) university’

(3) *Idę na uniwersytet* (Polish)

Go.PRS.1SG to university.ACC.SG

‘(I) go to (the) university’

(4) *Pracuję na uniwersyteci-e* (Polish)

Go.PRS.1SG at university-LOC.SG

‘(I) work at (the) university’

As we will see later on in this chapter and in Chapter 5 section 5.3 in the analysis of the prepositions found as an alternative to *dla/ dlja*, very often these spatial prepositions are used to

convey a much more abstract meaning, according to a metaphorical transfer that is very common in the languages of the world regardless of their linguistic kinship because it is deeply rooted in the biological functioning of the human brain as a way to organize our experience in the most economical way. For these reasons, even if their prototypical meaning, that is, the most usual, salient and central meaning they convey, concerns a physical motion or physical location of a physical body in a physical space, they can, and most often than not they do, appear in a much larger range of situations and more abstract events. These two prepositions have been studied at a much larger extent for their intensive use in everyday language, but the same principle applies, of course, to other prepositions or prepositional constructions as well.

There are other cases, in both Polish and Russian, in which the alternation of different cases with the same preposition is employed as a means to contribute to the construction or completion of the semantic value of the relation expressed by the prepositional phrase. They are, for instance, the preposition *o*, which is used before the accusative with the meaning ‘against’, in terms of physical contact or, more abstractly, confrontation, and before the locative/prepositional to express topic, like the English preposition ‘about’.

Also, in other prepositions the alternation of accusative and instrumental expresses either motion (with the accusative) or a static position (with the instrumental). In this group we find for instance the prepositions *nad*, ‘above’, which can take the accusative case to signal motion and the instrumental case for static spatial location in Polish but not in Russian, in which it is employed only with the instrumental case as we have seen before; Polish and Russian *za*, ‘behind’, which expresses motion with the accusative and static location with the instrumental in both languages; Polish and Russian *pod*, ‘under’, which works following the same principle. A couple of examples are provided below:

(5) *oH* *nođ* *cmoл-om.* (Russian)

On pod stol-om
PRON.3SG under table-INSTR.SG

‘He (is) under (the) table’

(6) *он клад-ëm ego nod stol.* (Russian)

On kladjet ego pod stol
PRON.3SG put.PRS.3SG PRON.3G.ACC under table.ACC.SG

‘He puts it under (the) table’

(7) *Jest pod stół-em* (Polish)

COP.3SG under table-INSTR.SG

‘(She/he) is under (the) table’

(8) *Wklada go pod stół* (Polish)

put.PRS.3SG PRON.3G.ACC under table.ACC.SG

‘(She/he) puts it under (the) table’

As we have seen in the examples from (1) to (4), the opposition of the accusative with another case, locative/prepositional or instrumental, is particularly productive with spatial prepositions, because in these occurrences the case represents the only grammatical element that indicates whether we are dealing with a motion towards a place or an object or simply with a static location. This feature is not unique to the Slavic languages that still rely on a lively nominal inflection, but can be observed also in other members of other Indo-European family, like Latin, which used to oppose the accusative case for motion with the ablative case for static location, or contemporary German in the West Germanic group, which alternates accusative and dative cases for the same purpose. Thus, this is not

an idiosyncrasy of the languages examined in this thesis but a rather common strategy at least in the Indo-European family.

In addition to that, we can find another peculiar instance, with the Polish preposition *z* and Russian *с(о)*, after which the genitive case indicates motion from a place, whereas the instrumental expresses the comitative, ‘with’, ‘together with’. In Polish, the genitive after *z* can indicate also cause, reason, or the material an object is composed of.

Despite the modern analytical tendencies described by Sosnowski and the gradual simplification of their case systems especially in colloquial registers, we can claim that Russian and Polish still maintain a characteristic that is crucial to synthetic languages: the capacity to express grammatical relations through the modification or insertion of dependent morphemes rather than by lexical means, with or without the relevant preposition. We can thus distinguish simple cases, like the many instances of simple dative in Russian that I will examine in Chapter 5, and cases preceded by a triggering preposition. The presence of prepositions and other grammatically functional items is necessary because the limited number of cases, six in both Russian and Polish, is clearly not sufficient to cover the much larger range of semantic roles and grammatical relations that are required for the sophisticated needs of human communication. Furthermore, some of these cases are not always differentiated in all three genders, feminine, masculine and neuter, and in the singular and plural forms. They may not be marked at all, like the accusative neuter, singular and plural, which is identical to the corresponding nominative in both Russian and Polish, or they may share the same suffix with one or more other cases, giving rise to case syncretism, like the accusative singular masculine animate, which is identical to the genitive singular in both languages again, and seems to have developed to compensate the loss of the masculine accusative mark at a certain point of its historical evolution.

In this sense, we do not need to take into account the analytical tendencies analysed by Sosnowski to conclude that Russian and Polish are not purely synthetic languages, because in linguistics analyticity and syntheticity are gradual concepts located on a scale rather than

complementary antonyms in which the presence of one element logically excludes the other. In the very same language or linguistic varieties, different morphological domains, like the verbal and the nominal ones, may display more or less analytic and synthetic traits compared to each other, and even within the same domain analytic and synthetic features may coexist. This is the case with Russian and Polish, where case morphemes are used in combination with prepositions and prepositional constructions composed by several lexical units or, as far as verbal morphology is concerned, conjunction endings and auxiliaries are used together to create more complex forms, like the future tense.

As I briefly mentioned before, it is challenging, if not impossible, to assign a fixed and unchanging meaning to a preposition out of contexts, because of their remarkable semantic indefiniteness and, consequently, flexibility. This is why a preposition like Polish *do*, as we will see in the corpus later, may be translated with the literal meaning of going towards a certain physical or geographical place, but it may also be employed in a wide range of non-literary contexts.

First of all, we can find it in metaphorical spatial contexts, in which the movement towards a location, a person or an object is still evoked and maintained but, rather than being interpreted literally, it refers to a more abstract situation, which may involve states of minds, complex behaviours, actions or attitudes. An example of this use is the very common turn of phrase (362 counts in Polish Web 2019 (plTenTen19))¹ *iść do diabła*, literally ‘to go to (the) devil’, the equivalent of the English curse “to go to hell”, where the act of moving towards the infernal destination should not be taken literally but, like in English, it means being chased away, abandoned, ignored or insulted depending on the situation.

Secondly, and this applies to the samples that we will see in the next chapters, the act of motion may not be recalled at all and often the verb to which the preposition is associated, in these cases, is not even a verb of motion. For instance, *do* is used as a temporal preposition as well, meaning “up to

¹ These results were collected through the *concordance* function of plTenTen19 on February 3rd, 2024

a certain time” and is therefore not limited to verbs of motion but to any action that is continued over time, like in sentence (9):

- (9) *Ja pracowałem do północ-y.*
PRON.1SG work.PST.1SG.M until midnight-GEN.SG
‘I worked until midnight’

Besides that, this preposition in Polish can be used also to express the meaning of purpose, like in the expression *pasta do butów*, literally ‘polish to shoes’ (the shoe polish) or *pasta do zębów* ‘paste to teeth’ (the toothpaste).

The same applies to Russian prepositions as well, of course, where, to take exactly the very same example, we find the same preposition with the same temporal meaning, but not with the meaning of purpose. The previous sentence can be thus translated in Russian in the same way and with the same preposition:

- (10) *Я работал до полуноч-и*
Ja rabotal do polunoč-i
PRON.1SG work.PST.SG.M until midnight-GEN.SG
‘I worked until midnight’

As Lakoff and Johnson (1980) point out, it is very common for spatial prepositions to be employed as temporal preposition as well cross-linguistically, and Polish and Russian make no exception. The previously mentioned spatial preposition *w/ v*, for instance, is also very frequently found as a temporal preposition. In Polish, *w* with the accusative case is used to introduce temporal expressions in fixed constructions like *w czas*, ‘in time’ or *w ciągu* ‘within’, with parts of the day, like

in *w nocy*, ‘in the night’, or with the days of the week, like in *w środę*, ‘on Wednesday’, whereas with the locative case it introduces temporal expressions concerning the months of the year, like *w styczniu*, ‘in January’, the years or the centuries. Perhaps more interestingly, it is used to indicate the duration of an action, like in the following example:

- (11) *Przeczytałem t-ę książk-ę w dwa dni.*
 PRF.read.PST.1SG.M DEM.ACC.SG.F book-ACC.SG in NUM.ACC
day.ACC.PL
 ‘(I) read this book in two days’

The same preposition *v* in Russian is used in similar temporal contexts with the accusative, with the days of the week again, like in *v sredu*, ‘on Wednesday’, the time of the day and in fixed temporal constructions like the above-mentioned *vo vremja* or *v tečenie*, ‘during’, followed by the genitive. Here again the prepositional case, like to Polish locative, is used in relation with the months of the year, like *v janvare*, ‘in January’, the years or the centuries. As far as the duration of the action is concerned, rather than *v*, Russian employs another spatial preposition we have seen before, *za* followed by the accusative, like in the sentence

- (12) *Прочитал эт-у книг-у за два дня.*
Pročital èt-u knig-u za dva dnja
 PRF.read.PST.SG.M DEM-ACC.SG book-ACC.SG in NUM.ACC.PL
day.ACC.PL

‘(I) read this book in two days’

These are the most well-known and common cases but certainly not the only ones. Other prototypical spatial prepositions undergo a metaphorical transfer to acquire a temporal meaning both in Russian and in Polish. Some examples are Polish *po*, that indicates motion within a circumscribed area, purpose of motion but also ‘after’, *przez* ‘through’ and ‘before’, or Russian *к*, that, in addition to ‘towards’ a physical location, means also ‘towards’ a temporal reference, so ‘at around/about’ a certain time. Even *на* is employed as a temporal preposition in Russian and in Polish to introduce duration in certain circumstances.

As I pointed out in this chapter, spatial and temporal prepositions are often expressed with the same linguistic means, in accordance with a very pervasive metaphor that processes temporal frameworks as spatial frameworks, assigning spatial coordinates to events that occur over time. This happens because we can concretely see the coordinates and references of space and orientate our physical body in our geographical environment, but time, on the other hand, is a completely abstract concept, created in our minds to organize the events we experience. As a matter of fact, relying on simpler and more concrete frameworks to express more elaborate or abstract scenarios is a very typical and recurring strategy of human cognition, in every domain, and thus also in language, through which our mental processes are more or less straightforwardly unveiled. In this sense languages are precious tools not only for the study of human language and language universals, but also for the study of the human mind in general. This aspect will be discussed in more details in Chapter 6 of this essay.

In the next chapter, I will start to introduce the preposition that constitutes the main subject of this paper, Polish *dla* and Russian *для*, which, as we have seen, takes only one case, the genitive in both languages, and can be roughly translated up to a certain extent with the English preposition ‘for’.

3. The preposition *dla/dlja*: history and functions, a general overview

3.1 Distribution of *dla/dlja* in the Slavic languages

Since the first written records, dated towards the end of the first millennium AD, the Slavic languages appear differentiated in three main branches: the South, the East and the West branch. As I previously mentioned, the two languages under consideration, Russian and Polish, belong to the East and the West branch respectively. Despite the fact that they are members of two different groups, in contrast to the other West and South Slavic languages they employ the same preposition *dla/dlja* that we roughly translated with the English preposition ‘for’ with the functions that we will examine in more details in this chapter. Ukrainian and Belarussian, both East Slavic languages like Russian, also feature this preposition. We must take into account, however, that Ukrainian and Belarussian are considered two separate languages, distinct from Russian, since the last few hundred years, therefore very recently, and they still now retain a significant degree of mutual intelligibility with Russian. Besides that, because of the geographical position of their reference countries, Ukraine and Belarus’, and their political history, they have been heavily affected by the other language of our interest, Polish, from which they borrowed numerous lexical items as well as morphological features. In light of this, it is not surprising that these two languages share a lexical peculiarity precisely with Russian, their closest and most recent relative, and with Polish, through constant and extended linguistic influence.

If we try to translate the preposition “for” to the other Slavic languages, on the other hand, we immediately notice that a recognizable variant of *dla* or *dlja* is nowhere to be seen. Let us take Czech for instance, another West Slavic language. If we search in the online English – Czech dictionary

Wordreference², we find a long list of prepositions that we have encountered in the previous chapter, like *na*, *pro*, *k* or *za*, but nothing similar to *dla* or *dlja*. If we try to translate the sentence “I buy it for you” with the platform Bing Translator³, we obtain the following results in Russian, Polish and Czech, which I faithfully report:

(1) *Ja pokupaju ego dlja vas.* (Russian)

(2) *Kupuję to dla ciebie.* (Polish)

(3) *Kupuji to pro tebe.* (Czech)

We do not need to analyse these short sentences in detail to immediately notice that Czech uses a different preposition, *pro*, where Polish and Russian have *dla* and *dlja*.

With other Slavic languages, namely Bulgarian, Macedonian, Croatian, Slovene, Serbian of the South branch and Slovak of the West branch, we obtain similar results. In order to avoid translations with simple datives, which, as we will see in this essay as well, are frequently found as an alternative to the preposition “for” especially with personal pronouns, this time I have translated the prepositional phrase “for the country” using Bing Translator⁴:

(4) *pre krajinu* (Slovak)

(5) *za zemlju* (Croatian)

(6) *za državo* (Slovenian)

(7) *za stranata* (Bulgarian)

(8) *za zemjata* (Macedonian)

(9) *za zeml'u* (Serbian)

² <https://www.wordreference.com/>

³ <https://www.bing.com/translator>, results collected on February 5th, 2024

⁴ <https://www.bing.com/translator>, results collected on February 5th, 2024

As we can see, in all these occurrences we may easily recognize prepositions we have met and commented before, but nothing close to *dla* or *dlja*. In Russian, Polish and Czech, of course, we have the same identical situation as before, where only Russian and Polish feature this preposition and Czech takes *pro*:

- (10) *dlja strany* (Russian)
- (11) *dla kraju* (Polish)
- (12) *pro danou zemi* (Czech)

With this last empirical research, we have verified once again that the preposition *dla/dlja* is a peculiarity of Polish and Russian, found also in Ukrainian and Belarusian for the reasons explained above, as it is reported in Slavic grammar textbooks and dictionaries.

3.2 Short history and development of *dla/dlja*

As Lozbe (1965) points out, the preposition *dla/dlja* was originally used as a postposition and, from approximately the XV-XVI century AD, gradually turned into a preposition. It was inherited from Proto-Slavic *db'la* and, before that, from the Baltic languages during the so-called Balto-Slavic period (approximately from the second millennium to the eighth century BC) in which these two separate families, Baltic and Slavic, were supposedly fused in one linguistic group. The Balto-Slavic group has been reconstructed and hypothesized through the historical comparative method on the attested Baltic and Slavic languages on the basis of the observed common lexical and morphological features.

This postposition, and later preposition, is the result of grammaticalization, a process through which a lexical element, equipped with an independent and heavier semantic core, gradually loses its original meaning and starts being employed as a grammatical element, such as an auxiliary, a

conjunction or a preposition. Afterwards, the erosion of the non-stressed *jer* contained in the preposition caused the phonological and orthographical variation that we can see nowadays.

Lozbe refers that Miklošič associates the postposition *dbl'a* with the word *dělb*, which used to have two distinct meanings: 1. part, share or side (translated with the German word '*Teil*') and 2. hill, mountain (translated with the German word '*Hügel*').

The first instance is associated with a concept of possession, belonging, which later evolved to the meaning of being part of something, therefore a part of a unit. The second one, 'hill' or 'mountain', is still recognizable in the Slavic languages we have seen in section 3.1 that do not have *dla/dlja* in their current range of prepositions. Lozbe refers that in contemporary Bulgarian, for example, the noun *dyal* still exists and means 'share', 'branch', but also 'hill' in a geographical sense. Besides that, he mentions the case of Rumanian, a Romance language that has been heavily influenced by Slavic lexical borrowings. In Rumanian also, the word *deal* has only the concrete meaning of 'hill', 'height' and did not undergo any grammaticalization process. Therefore, the very same lexeme that was present at the dawn of the Slavic family has not been completely lost in the languages we have examined before, but has simply taken a different path, as it often happens when language variants split up.

So, we have seen that in other languages this lexeme maintained its full semantic content, albeit with some nuanced variation over the centuries. What happened in Polish and in the East Slavic block that caused this very same element to be used in a more and more abstract way and then lose its original lexical status altogether and acquire a purely grammatical function as a postposition and later as a preposition?

We can trace back the preposition of contemporary Polish and Russian to an adjective and, at a later stage, a noun. The adjective *dbl'* was used with two different meanings: belonging, or being relevant to someone, and being a part, or a portion, of a unit after separation. At a second stage, the meaning "part", "share" became prevalent and started being used as a more lexicalized item, more

precisely as a noun. Whereas it maintained this concrete meaning in languages such as Rumanian and Bulgarian, in Russian and Polish it started being employed as a more abstract concept, in a more abstract sense. The process towards grammaticalization was thus initiated.

At this point this element started appearing in association with a noun, that preceded it and was declined in the genitive case, to express a starting point, a point of departure from what this noun denoted, consistently with the original meaning of “being a part of something”. The necessity of this new linguistic means to express point of departure from something arose following a case syncretism between the ablative and the genitive. The fact that the point of departure of an action or event was normally expressed with the ablative, which now could no longer be distinguished from the genitive, is at the root of this coincidence. The concept of “point of departure” or of “origin” of an action helps explain the three meanings that *dbl'a*, that by now had acquired the behaviour and function of a postposition, expressed: 1. Purpose, reason; 2. thanks to, by the will of; 3. regarding, concerning. The latter, together with the position of the relevant phrase that was usually placed at the beginning of the sentence, introduced the topic that would be discussed afterwards, a role that was earlier covered by the disappearing ablative case.

It should be clearer by now how the postposition and, later, preposition, acquired the semantic functions that we know today and that we will explore later in this chapter. In particular, of its earlier significations, the meaning of cause was gradually abandoned in the standard variants of the language and already in the XIX century we find it only in colloquial registers and later as dialectal forms in Russian.

The employment of the preposition *dla/dlja* or its earlier variants was gradually introduced in the lexical and grammar architecture of the language and took its time to establish itself and expand in the everyday vocabulary of its native speakers.

Gawronski (1922), for instance, highlights that in the Psalter of Jan Kochanowski, the so-called David's Psalter (in Polish *Psalterz Dawidow*), a poetic translation into Polish of the Book of

Psalms printed in Kraków in 1579, the preposition *dla* appears only ten times throughout the whole book and has in most cases a clear causal meaning, that Gawronski associates to the meaning of the Latin *propter*. Just in few of these cases, the causal interpretation is weaker and the meaning of the preposition is closer to the contemporary French preposition *pour*, that has a wider range of semantic values, among which the meaning of purpose. Less than a century later, in the *Facecje* (anecdotes) published in 1624, Gawronski counts 41 occurrences of *dla* in 186 pages, still with prevalent causal meaning.

The preposition *dla/dlja*, which is vastly employed in all registers of Polish and Russian today, owns its success to the slow and gradual labour of time and the gradual semantic and grammatical changes that emerged into contemporary oral and written productions.

3.3 Contexts and meanings in the current use of *dla/dlja*

Today the preposition *dla/dlja* is frequently found in many fixed expressions in both languages, like the widespread Russian interrogative phrase *dlja čego?* (278,197 counts in Russian Web 2017 (ruTenTen17))⁵, literally ‘for what?’ or the even more widespread Polish words *dlaczego?* (1,084,590 counts in Polish Web 2019 (plTenTen19))⁶, ‘why?’, and *dlatego* (2,062,008 counts in Polish Web 2019 (plTenTen19))⁷, ‘that’s why’, ‘therefore’, in which the prepositional element *dla* has been assimilated in the following pronoun and has lost its stress as well as its orthographical autonomy but is still clearly identifiable and recognizable.

Putting aside fossilized constructions, which do not constitute the main interest of the present research, in this part of the essay I will describe in which situations and with which meanings the

⁵ These results were collected through the *concordance* function of ruTenTen17 on February 9th, 2024

⁶ These results were collected through the *concordance* function of plTenTen19 on February 9th, 2024

⁷ These results were collected through the *concordance* function of plTenTen19 on February 9th, 2024

preposition under examination is commonly used in Russian and Polish, while providing and analysing concrete examples of its application.

Let us start by stating when Polish and Russian do *not* employ *dla/dlja*. To do that, I will take English as our main reference language while briefly mentioning other European languages as well in order to enrich the comparison and provide a better idea of the features and peculiarities of this preposition in the two Slavic languages.

In his semantic account of the English preposition “for”, Mueller (2016) identifies twelve semantic roles introduced by “for” that vary to a greater or lesser degree among each other. Since the semantics of English is not the subject of this essay, I will only focus on those that are not represented by the corresponding *dla/dlja* prepositions in Russian and Polish.

The first and probably most glaring case is temporal duration. As we all know, in English “for” is very frequently used to express the duration of an action in sentences like “I read for hours”. In Polish and Russian, in this context, we may find the simple instrumental case, like in (13) and (14):

- (13) Я час-ами чита-л-а (Russian)
 Ja čas-ami čita-l-a
 PRON.1SG hour-INSTR.PL read-PST-F
 ‘I read for hours’

- (14) Czyta-ł-am godzin-ami (Polish)
 read-PST-1SG.F hour-INSTR.PL
 ‘(I) read for hours’

As we can see in these examples, Russian and Polish display the same behaviour and take the very same case. However, it is not always possible to express duration with a simple case. When the

temporal indication is more precise, when the amount of time is more clearly specified with numerical values, for example, another preposition or prepositional construction is needed, like in the following sentences:

(15) Я работала два часа-a (Russian)

Ja rabotala dva čas-a

PRON.1SG work.PST.F two.ACC hour-ACC.PL

‘I worked for two hours’

(16) Pracowałam przez dwie godzin-y (Polish)

Work.PST.1SG.F for two.ACC hour-ACC.PL

‘(I) worked for two hours’

Here Russian and Polish employ different strategies, namely the accusative without preposition for Russian and the preposition *przez* for Polish, which, as it should be stressed, are not the only possible options. In Russian, for example, in the same contexts we may find the construction *v tečenie* + genitive, ‘in the course of’, ‘during’, whereas in Polish it is frequent the preposition *podczas*, ‘during’ followed by the genitive as well, whose literal translation would be ‘under (the) time’ and whose lexical element, *czas*, ‘time’, is still clearly recognizable and represents another instance of grammaticalization.

It should be noted that Russian and Polish are rather peculiar in this regard, since the employment of “for” as a temporal duration preposition is quite frequent in other European languages belonging to other families, like Italian, German or modern Greek, following a very pervasive mental representation based on the analogy between spatial extension and temporal extension. That does not mean that the same association between space and time is not found in Russian and Polish since, as

we have seen in Chapter 2, *przez* is above all a spatial preposition. What changes is rather the way space and, consequently, time are conceived by the speakers.

Another case in which we find “for” in English but not in Russian and Polish is what Mueller calls the distance meaning, exemplified by his sentence “(Someone) headed for Tokyo”, in which the stress on the coincidence between geographical destination and purpose can be easily spotted. This option with *dla/dlja* is not available in Polish and Russian, as shown in these two translations taken from Bing Translator⁸ (and confirmed with Google Translate):

(17) Я направился в Токио (Russian)
Ja naprawilsja v Tokio
PRON.1SG direct.PST.REFL in Tokyo
‘I directed myself in Tokyo’

(18) Udałem się do Tokio (Polish)
Manage.PST-1SG.M REFL towards Tokyo
‘(I) managed myself to Tokyo’

In these two sentences in Polish and Russian the purpose component is expressed, but with other linguistic means, namely leveraging the semantical value of the preceding verb (to direct, to manage) rather than using the preposition that is more prototypically employed to introduce the role of purpose.

As we have mentioned before, *dla/dlja* tends not to be employed to introduce causal constructions, in contrast to English. In Polish and Russian in these cases we rather find the preposition *za*, which,

⁸ <https://www.bing.com/translator>, results collected on February 10th, 2024

as we may recall, is mainly used with the spatial meaning of “behind”, followed by the accusative case. The English sentence “He is in prison for murder” will therefore be translated like this:

(19) *Он сидит в тюрьме за убийство* (Russian)

Он сидит в тюрьме за убийство

PRON.3SG.M stay.3SG in prison-PREP.SG for murder.ACC.SG

‘He is in prison for murder’

(20) *Siedzi w więzieniu za morderstwo* (Polish)

stay.3SG in prison-LOC.SG for murder.ACC.SG

‘(She/he) is in prison for murder’

It is interesting to notice the combination with the accusative case, rather than with the instrumental, to express the causal meaning. As we have seen, the accusative is used for motion in contrast with the instrumental, which expresses static location instead. In this case, it contributes to build the idea of the cause-effect framework as a dynamic schema of events and their consequences, of actions and reactions, rather than a motionless abstract picture. The preposition *za* is so often employed to explicate the cause that it became part of fixed pragmatic formulas, such as compliments or thanksgivings. We thus find, in Polish, *dziękuję za możliwość* and, in Russian, *spasibo za vozmožnost’*, for the English expression ‘thank you for the opportunity’, among many other examples we could propose.

Lastly, the preposition “for”, in English, introduces complements of certain verbs, such as “to wait” or “to search”, for reasons that are undoubtedly linked to the sense of purpose of the action expressed by the verb and became so integrated in the verbal constructions that the absence of this preposition in most cases would be perceived as ungrammatical, like in “*I am waiting you”. In

Russian and Polish we do not find *dla/dlja* after the same verbs but it is not surprising, because these rigid combinations of verb + preposition “for” are a peculiarity of English, as their absence in other European languages like Italian, German (that resorts to other prepositions, like *auf* or *nach* respectively in these two particular cases) or modern Greek attests.

The sematic roles identified by Mueller are very detailed and specific and for the purposes of our research it is not necessary to examine and comment each one of them. We can therefore be satisfied with the ones I have analysed so far to have an idea of the limits of application of *dla/dlja* in Russian and Polish compared with English.

So far, we have been able to observe how the distribution of this preposition is much more restricted compared to their translation in English, covering a much more limited number of semantic roles. Now it is time to explain when *dla/dlja* is used in our two Slavic languages and which meaning they convey. I briefly recall that the preposition *dla/dlja*, in both languages, occurs only with the genitive case in all the instances.

Firstly, like English “for”, *dla/dlja* introduces the semantic role of beneficiary, that is the recipient of the action, more typically an animate individual or group of individuals, animal or human, but also, in Polish but not in Russian, when the action towards the individual or group of individuals is harmful and negative for them, the maleficiary. Below is one example of beneficiary:

- (21) *Я* *куплю* *его* *для тебя* (Russian)
 Ja *kuplju* *ego* *dlja tebja*
 PRON.1SG buy.1SG.FUT PRON.3GS.M.ACC for PRON.2SG.GEN

‘I will buy it for you’

- (22) *Kupię* *to* *dla ciebie* (Polish)
 Buy.1SG.FUT DEM.ACC for PRON.2SG.GEN

‘(I) will buy it for you’

When the goal of an action is not an animate beneficiary or maleficiary that is meant to benefit or to suffer from it but an inanimate, concrete or abstract object, we no longer talk about a beneficiary or maleficiary participant, but we are rather dealing with a signification of purpose. The action is thus projected to obtain a certain result, for the good (or the bad) of an inanimate object, a concept, a plan or an ideology, for example.

(23) *Спорт важен для здоровья* (Russian)
sport važen dlja zdorov-’ja
sport important.SG for health-GEN.SG
‘Sport (is) important for health’

(24) *Sport jest ważny dla zdrowi-a* (Polish)
sport COP.3SG important.SG for health-GEN.SG
‘Sport is important for health’

The connection between the beneficiary/maleficiary and the purpose meaning is very close: in both cases there is an action that is seen as oriented towards a goal, which is animate in the first case and inanimate in the second one. Cognitively speaking, it is a very similar schema. If we are to refer to the conceptual terms applied by cognitive linguists, the path that describes the imaginary action line is basically the same. Only the landmark, which is the recipient of the action in this case, differs for its animacy value.

Another area of application of *dla/dlja* that we will often encounter in the corpus is the *iudicantis* role, which more typically introduces the person(s) for which a certain state of affairs or

possible to use the preposition “to”, which took over most instances in which the dative case was used, instead of “for”. It is thus linguistically acceptable to say that “something is weird to me” instead of “for me”. A similar scenario applies for the other European languages I have mentioned earlier. The discussion will be longer and more complicated in the beneficiary/maleficiary case, as we will see in the section dedicated to alternative prepositions in Chapter 5.

If we investigate and analyse linguistic productions with sufficient zeal, we will surely find many more sub-groups or sub-categorizations than the ones I have identified in this paragraph on the basis of more sophisticated semantic nuances, but it is not the purpose of this essay to dig so deeply into the different meanings that our preposition may acquire and express, so the cases I have mentioned in this chapter should be enough for now.

Now that I have briefly introduced the prepositions and case systems in Russian and Polish and analysed in more detail the preposition that we are going to study, it is time to enter the very core of this essay and discuss the methods, parameters and results of my empirical research.

4. The Corpus: collection parameters and research methodology

4.1 The Russian National Corpus (RNC)

The data for my empirical research have been collected from the website of the Russian National Corpus (in Russian *Национальный корпус русского языка*), more specifically in the parallel sub-corpus Russian – Polish and Polish - Russian, between October 2023 and February 2024.

The Russian National Corpus, thereafter RNC, has been partially accessible through a query interface online since 2004 and is composed of heterogeneous linguistic material collected under the supervision of the Russian Academy of Sciences (in Russian *Российская академия наук (РАН)*) that created the platform.

The whole Corpus includes data from the most diverse sources and linguistic registers: among them, narrative prose (classical and modern fiction), poetry, modern newspaper contents, spoken language, private messages, blogs, social media data, technical and academic articles and even local Russian dialects productions. It thus covers all sociolinguistic varieties of Russian, standard, substandard, colloquial and dialectal of the past and modern era. Its data are stretched over a wide period of time, from the first East Slavic manuscripts of the XI century AD to the very recent productions of the first decades of the XXI century. In its global aspect, the RNC can be considered a large representative corpus of different synchronic and diachronic varieties of the Russian language, made up of general and specialized corpora taken from the most disparate fields and communicative environments.

Beside a very ample monolingual section, the RNC offers several bilingual parallel corpora with many European and some of the most widespread non-European languages, like Chinese and

Hindi, and even a multilingual corpus in which parallel texts from more than two languages at a time are collected. As shown in the “Corpora statistics” section of the platform, texts in languages other than Russian in any of its variants and diachronic stages are significantly scarce compared to the global number of tokens. Polish tokens, for example, make up only a tiny 0.3% of the total⁹. However, the possibility to consult this bilingual parallel corpus has been extremely important for my research, as we will see shortly, since all my empirical data to carry out my contrastive study of Russian and Polish have been collected in this section.

At the moment, most of the items contained in the whole Corpus are from the media (37.8%) and, more specifically, national media (36.2%). A relevant percentage of the overall tokens belongs to social networks as well (7.5%)¹⁰, which suggests that the amount of the most recent productions is increasing. It should be noted that the RNC is an open corpus and is consequently updated and augmented on a regular basis to provide more and more recent and diversified data for linguistic research. For this reason, as I have already mentioned in the Introduction, I always specify when my examples were collected, since the website may be modified in the meantime and contain different samples at a later date.

Another important feature of this platform is that any new element entered in the RNC undergoes automated indexing through a specific software and all corpora, in Russian and in other foreign languages alike, are therefore annotated. All forms contained in the large Corpus (about a billion, currently) are automatically lemmatized and POS-/grammeme-tagged and all possible morphological analyses for each orthographic form are ascribed to it. Besides that, metatextual references, such as name and general biographical details of the author, title of the source text, date of production, text sizes and text genre, are provided.

⁹ As of February 13th, 2024

¹⁰ All these figures have been collected on February 13th, 2024

Among the many operations that the user can perform, one that has been very useful to select my initially numerous results, as I will explain later in this chapter, is the option to create and save permanently a customized sub-corpus by adding additional filters before visualising the contents.

4.2 Data collection

After defining the subject of the research, that is, the distribution of the preposition *dla/dlja* in the two languages and the competing forms that can occur in the same semantic and syntactic environment, my very first task was to find a suitable parallel corpus Russian – Polish and vice versa to collect my empirical data. The essential requirements I established for this purpose are the following.

First of all, it had to be a general corpus, not a highly specialized one containing large portions of technical terms and linguistic structures of one specific domain, such as law, mechanics or literary criticism, because the focus of my research is on the use of the preposition *dla/dlja* in standard, everyday language and not in one specific domain. For this reason, online or printed handbooks, technical manuals, political or juridical norms, academic writings and the like have been categorically avoided.

Secondly, the corpus had to contain recent texts and display at least the year in which they were produced in order to identify their temporal collocation, because this is a study of synchronic linguistics in two contemporary linguistic varieties. Diachronic developments and earlier productions are not of interest here and have thus been excluded.

Thirdly, I searched for a balanced corpus, rather than an ad-hoc corpus created for some other fixed-in-advance purpose or to study a very specific and rare phenomenon, which would have needlessly limited my empirical field.

The Russian – Polish parallel section of the Russian National Corpus is not very rich, but since I was looking for a preposition, that is, one of the most widely used elements in languages that tends

to have a high number of occurrences in all sociolinguistic varieties for its functional characteristics, it was satisfactory for this purpose. We must also consider that the percentage of Polish tokens that I have reported previously, 0.3% on the total tokens of the RNC, is calculated on a very ample collection of corpora and data, therefore its exiguity is relative and must be compared to the extent of the whole Corpus.

The Russian – Polish parallel corpus has another important limit that must be considered before undertaking any research: it is composed of literary and journalistic texts only, more precisely prose and fiction works. Also, the number of texts included in the whole corpus is quite scarce: only 54¹¹, all of them original Russian or original Polish works with one attested translation in the other language. No original foreign texts are present. However, once again, since my focus was on such a frequent linguistic element and since these 54 texts belong to different authors and different translators and offer mainly productions in a general, standard and more or less formal or colloquial language, it did nevertheless suit my purpose. For more specific language varieties, such as local dialects or slangs, this corpus would obviously be qualitatively inadequate, but this is not our case.

As far as the date of the texts is concerned, in the Russian – Polish parallel section they go from approximately the middle of the XIX century to the first decades of the XXI century, therefore the last two hundred years, almost. If we search the Polish word *dla* in the corpus, without setting any filter, the oldest samples belong to “The Captain's Daughter” (in Russian “*Капитанская дочка*”), by Aleksandr Puskin, published in 1836, and the most recent ones to a Polish article that has not been translated into English yet, “*Nie mówcie nam: On się rozbił*” (‘Don’t tell us: he crashed’, my translation) by Waław Radziwinowicz, published in 2011.

In order to exclude constructions that may be too obsolete and out-of-use nowadays in either language, I set up an additional filter to avoid all texts originally published before 1920. This year has been chosen because in 1918, just after the Revolution, Russian underwent an important linguistic

¹¹ As of February 14th, 2024

and orthographic reform as well, aimed at cleaning the language from elements and features that were considered antiquated. Thus, by setting up my chronological range from 1920, I could ensure to exclude all these older forms that are not to be found since then. The RNC gave me the option to save this parameter permanently and create my own sub-corpus, which I have been using throughout my empirical research.

It would have been possible to set up the language of the original texts as well, Russian or Polish only of course, since foreign texts are not represented in this parallel corpus, in order to exclude the instances contained in translated samples. However, since the subject of this research is the preposition *dla/dlja* and its competing forms from a purely grammatical point of view, this parameter is not relevant in our case and I have not considered it.

At this point, once all initial parameters were set up, I started examining, selecting and collecting my data. The parallel corpus gives the option to choose Polish or Russian lemmas, words, grammatical features, semantic features or additional features, to be selected from a menu, but also the possibility to access an “Exact search” section, in which individual words as well as word combination and even whole phrases can be searched for. This latter option has been particularly useful to me, because by searching only the word *dla* for Polish, or *dlja* for Russian, the number of samples is significant and includes too many instances that are not interesting for us anyway because, for example, they may belong to fossilized constructions such as the previously mentioned *dlja čego* that do not have competing forms because they are unchangeable by definition.

It became clear from the beginning that the fastest way to proceed in order to have a higher probability to find interesting results and sufficient numbers to set up a statistic was to look for the preposition *dla* or *dlja* (depending on the language examined at that moment) followed by a personal pronoun. On the other hand, the search for *dla/dlja* followed by a specific noun, even the supposedly most common ones, such as nouns belonging to the family and affective domain, like “mother”, “father”, “son”, “friend” and so on, did not bring many results because of the narrowness of the corpus and the thematic and, consequently, lexical heterogeneity of the texts taken into account. This is why

I decided to look for and examine the samples with the preposition in combination with five personal pronouns, in both languages, namely the corresponding forms of “for me”, “for you” (second person singular), “for her”, “for him” and “for us”. This already gave me hundreds of samples to be analysed and several dozens of examples that were finally selected on the basis of the criteria that I am about to illustrate and included in the corpus that will be examined in the next chapter.

After that, in order to have a more complete overview of the phenomena and retrieve cases that were inevitably excluded by the decision of looking for pronouns (especially the occurrences with inanimate participants), I collected a few more examples searching for *dla* and *dlja* individually, without setting specific nouns or pronouns. As noticed beforehand and as expected, the great majority of the instances found with this query were either already known because they contained one of the five above-mentioned pronouns or useless for our research because they were part of fixed linguistic forms or other idiosyncratic structures. However, I could find and select a few examples (9 for Polish *dla* and 14 for Russian *dlja* to be more precise) that contain useful additional information as we will see.

Once the samples containing *dla* for the Polish section of the corpus and *dlja* for the Russian section of the corpus were collected, my task was to compare the corresponding parallel text on the side and check if it contained the same preposition in the same place or not. If the same preposition occurred in both languages, thus no alternative form was provided, the sample was discarded without further examination.

There are other simple cases in which the sample has been rejected, even if the parallel language did not contain the preposition.

First of all, since the prepositional phrases introduced by *dla/dlja* in Polish and Russian are almost always adjuncts, they are not compulsory to complete the meaning of the verb and can in many cases be omitted accordingly. As a consequence, it occurred that the preposition did not appear in the parallel text simply because the relevant information was left out or added by the translator according

to their translation choices. In this case there was simply nothing to compare *dla/dlja* with and the relevant samples have been excluded.

In other cases, *dla/dlja* was part of a fixed linguistic construction that, having fossilized, is unvarying and insensitive to the surrounding linguistic environment by definition. It could be found in the other language in a very similar, or perhaps even the same, linguistic construction, or another preposition or another structure altogether was put in its place. In any case, its static and inflexible nature does not make it a suitable candidate for our research. An example of this is the Polish expression *dla przykładu*¹² versus the Russian *naprimer*, ‘for example’, which are simply to be taken as they are. This kind of samples have been left out as well, as they do not provide any useful information for our study on alternative forms to *dla/dlja*.

These cases were quite simple to identify and discard. Others were less straightforward. Since the alternative forms, other prepositions or simple cases, had to occur in the same semantic and syntactic environment to be considered valid and included in my corpus, I had to translate and analyse carefully both texts to make sure that this essential condition was fulfilled even though the response was not always clear-cut. When I mentioned the polysemy and semantic flexibility of prepositional items in the first chapter of this dissertation, I specified that these features, to varying degrees, apply to all elements of a language. Even more semantically full items, like verbs and nouns, do not rigidly and univocally correspond to one and only one meaning, especially when we compare different languages to each other. For instance, the Italian noun *tempo* can be translated in English with ‘time’ or ‘weather’ depending on the context, therefore, from the point of view of an English speaker, it cannot be considered “the same word” in different contexts. A certain degree of polysemy is present in all elements of a language, so much that Cognitive Linguistics considers polysemy the normal state of affairs rather than an eccentric anomaly concerning only a minority of the vocabulary items of a language. This lack of perfect semantic correspondence in words translated into different languages,

¹² Andrzej Sapkowski. *Boży bojownicy* (1) (2004), collected in RNC in February, 2024

especially when they convey more abstract and complex meanings, requires in certain cases a bit more of reflection to avoid taking into account two elements that cannot be considered analogous. For instance, I have accepted synonyms like *rentabel'nych* and *oplacalnych*¹³ in few occasions, but only after making sure that they really were being used in the same sense.

It is even more challenging when it comes to slightly different constructions. At first, I have discarded almost all of them except for 6 occurrences, which I would call borderline cases that can be considered suitable candidates or not depending on the strictness of the selection criteria and the amplitude of the linguistic research established more or less subjectively by the researcher. In these 6 cases, if the semantic conditions were more or less the same, the syntactic structure varied to a greater or lesser extent, thus violating one of the two principles I have observed so far. Let us consider the example (1)¹⁴

(1) *Był to dla mnie wstrząs* (Polish)
 COP.PST.3SG DEM dla PRON.1SG.GEN shock
 ‘Was this for me (a) shock’

(2) *Я был потрясен.* (Russian)
ja byl potrjasen
 PRON.1SG COP.PST.3SG shocked.SG
 ‘I was shocked’

¹³ Andrzej Kublik. W Polsce trwa gorączka gazu łupkowego, a Rosja boi się łupków (Gazeta Wyborcza) (17.12.2010), collected in RNC in December, 2023

¹⁴ Jerzy Andrzejewski. Popiół i diament (1948), collected in RNC in October, 2023

As we can see here, in Polish we have an impersonal construction followed by the prepositional phrase expressing the role of *iudicantis*, whereas in Russian we find a nominal predicate where the adjective describes the narrator's state of mind.

I was initially doubtful regarding the possibility to allow slightly different syntactic structures into my corpus, but then I decided to exclude them and to focus exclusively on competing linguistic means, simple cases and other prepositions only as it turned out, appearing in the same syntactic environment. These 6 samples of different constructions, all with Polish *dla* introducing the *iudicantis* role and a different Russian construction, will thus not be included in the Appendixes nor examined in the next chapter.

In many other cases the samples whose parallel text in the other language did not include *dla/dlja* were excluded because the whole text portion was worded in a completely different way. Since the tokens that make up the RNC parallel Russian – Polish section are journalistic and literary texts, the translations provided are the product of personal stylistic and translation decisions taken by each translator. Therefore, we find more or less free translations that correspond more or less faithfully to the original texts. For instance, most of the occurrences from “Lolita” by Vladimir Nabokov sided by Michał Kłobukowski's translation have been discarded because the Russian and the Polish text were so different syntactically and/or semantically speaking, that they could not be compared. In this specific case, the fact that the text translated by Kłobukowski was the first original version in English may have played a role as well.

For these reasons, the number of suitable occurrences, which will be reported in the Appendixes, are much less numerous than the numerical difference between the Polish *dla* and the Russian *dlja* found for every query.

It should be noted that this RNC parallel section may not be suitable for researches aimed at quantifying the general distribution of the preposition in Russian compared to Polish and vice versa or, at least, it should not be used as the main source of data in this regard. If we look for the word *dla*

alone in Polish in our sub-corpus of parallel texts from the year 1920, we obtain 2,611 samples. If we search for the word *dlja* alone in Russian, on the other hand, we receive a significant higher number of results: 3,006 samples. However, all the queries with pronouns have always given higher counts for Polish than for Russian. *Dla mnie*, ‘for me’ in Polish, for example, has given 229 samples, whereas the Russian equivalent, *dla menja*, has only 197¹⁵ occurrences. Consistently with these results, I have found and collected more occurrences of Polish *dla* than of Russian *dlja* in my corpus, as we will see in Chapter 5.

This apparent contradiction between the total occurrences of *dla* and *dlja* in isolation, which seem to suggest that the preposition is prevalent in Russian, and the occurrences found while searching more specifically for pronominal constructions, where Polish has higher occurrences instead, may have various explanations.

First of all, if we search for *dla/dlja* alone, also the fossilized expressions containing this preposition will be presented and counted. In particular, the interrogative *dlja čego*, which we have seen before, is very widespread in Russian, therefore many Russian occurrences with *dlja* contain it. In Polish, on the other hand, constructions like *dlatego* or *dlaczego*, also very frequent, are not included in the count simply because they are attached to the following word, thus they are not recognized as forms of the preposition *dla*. This purely orthographic divergence contributes significantly to a higher count of *dlja* in Russian than in Polish.

The points described previously play a role as well, up to a certain extent, in these apparent discrepancies: if the preposition is omitted or, on the contrary, repeated several times in one language and not in the other for stylistic and translation reasons, the automatic count will be different of course, but that does not provide information on the general use and diffusion of the preposition in one language compared to the other.

¹⁵ All these figures have been collected on February 17th, 2024

For these reasons, the RNC, in this regard, should not be taken as a reliable indicator of this parameter and, if consulted, should be integrated with other richer and perhaps more diaphasically diversified sources of data.

Since the subject of this thesis is the competing forms, prepositions and simple cases, used as alternatives of *dla/dlja* in Russian and Polish, this issue does not really affect the validity and the outcome of my research and will no longer be mentioned from now on. In the next chapter I will turn to the analysis of the corpus and comment the concrete samples collected according to the principles and parameters discussed here.

5. The Corpus: classification and analysis of the samples

5.1 Presentation and classification of the data

All the samples from the Russian National Corpus that are commented in this essay have been collected between October 2023 and February 2024 and in this chapter the date of retrieval will no longer be reported in footnote for every single occurrence. The date in which the samples have been collected is to be intended as included within this timeframe unless otherwise explicitly specified. As far as samples from other online sources, such as the Sketch Engine corpora, are concerned, the date of collection will instead be indicated.

The complete corpus with the relevant metatextual information (author and translator, original and translated title of the work from which the sample was taken, date of publication and translation), numbered, classified according to the language and the competing forms found, flanked by the semantic role of the prepositional phrase and translated literally into English, is available in the Appendix at the end of this essay, since it is not feasible nor useful to analyse each one of the 133 samples that have been collected and only few of them will be examined in this chapter. Besides that, since in many cases the sentences in the original texts are unnecessarily long and articulated for our purpose, throughout this chapter I will cut out and analyse only the portions containing the elements of our interest, but their longer versions will be reported in the Appendix. For each sample of the corpus that will be analysed in this chapter and in Chapter 6, the corresponding reference number listed in the Appendix will be added in footnote for a quicker consultation of the original data source.

First of all, it should be noted that all the samples, with Polish *dla* and parallel Russian alternative form and vice versa, have been divided in two major groups: the group with the simple

dative case as the competing form, in which the parallel text has only the dative case without any preposition instead of the preposition *dla/dlja*, and the group in which another preposition is used instead of *dla/dlja*. No other competing constructions have been found without varying the original semantic and/or syntactic environment.

Each occurrence in both groups and for both languages has been then assigned a semantic role, in order to contextualize and explain, from the point of view of Cognitive Linguistics, the reason for the presence of one linguistic form or another. The semantic roles identified in my corpus samples are the following three: purpose, beneficiary/maleficiary and *iudicantis*, thus confirming what has been discussed in Chapter 2, namely that the cases in which the preposition *dla/dlja* occurs, in both languages, are significantly less numerous than in English or other European languages.

Here below, I provide an overview of the collected results with their classification and numerical values, both in absolute numbers and percentages:

Chart 1

POLISH COMPETING FORMS (37 samples)		
Semantic roles	Simple dative	Other prepositions
	14 37,84%	23 62,16%
Iudicantis	11 78,57%	6 26,09%
Beneficiary/maleficiary	3 21,43%	5 21,74%
Purpose	0 0,00%	12 52,17%

Chart 2

RUSSIAN COMPETING FORMS (96 samples)		
Semantic roles	Simple dative	Other prepositions
	66 68,75%	30 31,25%
Iudicantis	45	5

	68,18%	16,67%
Beneficiary/maleficiary	21 31,82%	21 70.00%
Purpose	0 0,00%	3 10,00%
Purpose/beneficiary	0 0,00%	1 3,33%

In the next paragraph I will analyse and comment the occurrences with the simple dative for both languages and then, in the following one, the occurrences with other prepositions. The samples will always be presented with the *dla/dlja* occurrence first and then with the alternative form (dative or other preposition), regardless of the language.

It should be noted that the English translations I provided under each sample are in many cases literal translations for both Russian and Polish, especially when it comes to the alternative prepositions, in order to better highlight their semantic value. For this reason, they may often sound unnatural or even ungrammatical.

5.2 Simple dative

Haspelmath (2006) associates the dative with more concrete cases such as the benefactive and destinative, which, as we have seen in the third chapter of this essay, express functions covered by the preposition *dla/dlja* both in Russian and in Polish. Dąbrowska (1997:16) states that “The dative case is the grammatical exponent of the target person role”¹⁶, where the target person role is not the active participant of the event, which is prototypically expressed by the nominative case, but the person for which the action is intended. In other words, the dative is once again the case of the beneficiary (or maleficiary) and the recipient.

¹⁶ Dąbrowska, Ewa, “Cognitive Semantics and the Polish Dative”, Mouton de Gruyter 1997

The outcome of my research in the Russian National parallel Corpus confirms this notion. As shown in Chart 2, out of the 96 cases in which the Polish preposition *dla* is rendered with another form in Russian, 66 are with simple dative, that is more than 68% of the occurrences. In general, I have found much less cases in which the Russian preposition *dlja* is expressed with other means in Polish, only 37 occurrences in total as shown in Chart 1, of which 14 are with simple dative. It is certainly a much lower percentage compared to the opposite case, barely an approximate 37% of the samples, but still statistically relevant.

These figures allow us to draw our first conclusions: the simple dative as an alternative grammatical form to the preposition *dla/dlja* is found much more often in Russian than in Polish and, in general, in the semantic and syntactic environments expressed in these samples, Polish *dla* is more used than Russian *dlja*.

The second question we should address concerns the semantic roles that are expressed with the simple dative. In the case of Russian datives, out of the 66 occurrences, 45 concern the role of *iudicantis* and the remaining 21 the beneficiary/maleficiary. More particularly, of these 21 we have only one occurrence with maleficiary because, like in many other languages, the maleficiary role tends to be expressed with other, more specific, linguistic means, such as the preposition “against” (in Polish *przeciwko* and in Russian *protiv*). In the samples below, the cases (1) and (2) express the role of *iudicantis* and the cases (3) and (4) the role of beneficiary.

(1) *Do tej pory były dla mnie zrozumiałe*

to DEM.GEN time.GEN.SG COP.PST.3PL for PRON.1SG.GEN understandable.PL

‘So far (they) were for me understandable’

(2) *До сих пор они были мне*

do sich por oni byli mnie

to DEM.GEN time.GEN.PL PRON.3PL COP.PST.PL PRON.1SG.DAT

понятны

ponjatny

understandable.PL

‘So far they were to me understandable’¹⁷

(3) *Zamów dla mnie koniak*

order.IMP.2SG for PRON.1SG.GEN cognac.ACC.SG

‘Order for me cognac’

(4) *Закажите мне лучше коньяк-у*

zakažite мне лучше кон’jak-и

order.IMP.2PL PRON.1SG.DAT better cognac-ACC.SG

‘Better order (to) me cognac’¹⁸

In the occurrences (3) and (4) the target or recipient role is literal and straightforward: the first-person referent, introduced by the preposition *dla* in Polish and declined in the dative in Russian, is the target beneficiary of the action, in this case ordering the cognac. The cases (1) and (2) concerning the *iudicantis* are more abstract: unlike the sentences (3) and (4), the referent here is not the recipient of an action aimed at their benefit (or malefit), but the person for which a certain statement or state of affairs applies and to which it is restricted. Therefore, in this second case the participant can be considered the target of the event only in a much broader and figurative sense. Both the beneficiary/maleficiary and the *iudicantis* roles have in common the fact that the situation, action or statement described applies specifically to them even though they do not take an active part in the

¹⁷ Appendix sample (1)

¹⁸ Appendix sample (4)

event but rather undergo it, in positive or negative terms, but the beneficiary/maleficiary definitely represents the most prototypical target role between the two. In all these cases and, as we will shortly see, also when Polish takes the dative, the participant is always an animate and, more specifically, a human referent.

Dąbrowska (1997) introduces the notion of personal sphere of potency to explain the contraposition between agentive participants, which hold the control of the action and are typically found in the nominative, the agent case par excellence, and passive participants, whose individual sphere of influence is subjected to the action of an external agent, and which are typically found in dative constructs. The dative is employed also when the most prominent participant does not perform the action, but rather experience it without being able to direct it. In many languages, among which Polish and Russian, the dative introduces the experiencer role as well, which has a clear semantic contiguity with the *iudicantis* role. One of the most salient examples is the widely used expression dative + *podoba* in Polish and dative + *nravitsja* in Russian, ‘to like’.

Apresjan and Letuchiy (2023), after carrying out an extensive analysis on verbs and predicatives that can take dative arguments as well as *dlja*, came to the conclusion that in Russian the dative is used to mark participants who are more affected by the situation, whereas *dlja* signals a greater distance and a focus on the action itself rather than on the effect on the participant. It is thus a matter of semantic nuance, which does not radically change the meaning of the linguistic construction but only the way we imagine and represent it.

If we look at the opposite case, in which the Russian preposition *dlja* is rendered with the Polish dative case, the situation looks very similar. Of the 14 occurrences I mentioned before, 11 concern the *iudicantis* and 3 the beneficiary/maleficiary role. The proportions of the represented semantic roles are quite similar in percentage points also: in the previous case, with Polish *dla* and Russian dative, it was a bit over 68% *iudicantis* and almost 32% beneficiary/maleficiary, whereas now, with Russian *dlja* and Polish dative, it is over 78% *iudicantis* and almost 22% beneficiary/maleficiary. In both languages, therefore, the *iudicantis* role is overrepresented by the

dative compared to the beneficiary/maleficiary role which, as we will see in the next paragraph, tend to be expressed by other prepositions instead, especially in Polish.

Here again I show two samples (5) and (6) with Russian *dlja* and Polish dative in the role of *iudicantis* and two samples (7) and (8) in the role of beneficiary:

(5) *Так будет лучше и для нее и для нас*

tak budet lučše i dlja nee i dlja nas

so COP.FUT.3SG better and for PRON.3SG.F.GEN and for PRON.1PL.GEN

‘So (it) will be better both for her and for us’

(6) *I jej będzie lepiej, i nam*

and PRON.3SG.F.DAT COP.FUT.3SG better and PRON.1PL.DAT

‘Both to her (it) will be better, and to us’¹⁹

(7) *А я не люблю, когда для меня устраивают*

a ja ne ljublju, kogda dlja menja ustraivajut

but PRON.1SG NEG like-1SG when for PRON.1SG.GEN arrange.3PL

‘But I don’t like when (they) arrange for me’

(8) *А ja nie lubię, jak mi załatwiają*

but PRON.1SG NEG like.1SG how PRON.1SG.DAT arrange.3PL

‘But I don’t like how (they) arrange to me’²⁰

¹⁹ Appendix sample (74)

²⁰ Appendix sample (68)

From a semantic point of view, we can interpret the samples from (5) to (8) like the samples from (1) to (4), with the only difference that the languages are reversed.

It is interesting to note that the translations of the dative case samples in English, which I have decided to turn into prepositional phrases introduced by “to”, perhaps the closest available form to the long-lost dative case that also English used to possess, is linguistically acceptable as well, especially in the *iudicantis* role, even though also English uses extensively the preposition “for” in these cases. As other Indo-European languages that have, at least, a remnant of nominal and/or pronominal inflection demonstrate, this association between the dative and the *iudicantis* role is certainly not a rare phenomenon, thus providing a cross-linguistical confirmation to Dąbrowska’s analysis. In German and in Italian, for example, personal pronouns are often found in the dative case when expressing the role of *iudicantis*, like in the sentences *Mir ist es klar* and *Mi è chiaro*, ‘It is clear to me’.

Whereas the relative numerical proportions between the two alternative forms to *dla/dlja* (namely the simple dative or another preposition) and the two semantic roles covered by the dative (namely and *iudicantis* and the beneficiary/maleficiary) are quite similar in Russian and Polish, the figures show a very clear predominance of the dative case in Russian compared to Polish in absolute terms: as I have mentioned at the beginning of the paragraph, I counted 66 Russian datives versus barely 14 Polish datives. How could this discrepancy be explained?

The tendency towards an increased analyticity, detected by Sosnowski (2011) in both languages and mentioned in the first chapter of this thesis, could be more pronounced and accelerated in one language than in the other, thus offering a possible explanation for the more extensive use of a prepositional phrase instead of the simple dative case in contemporary Polish than in contemporary Russian.

Sołtysiak (2005), on the other hand, provides a much more specific and straightforward answer to our question: he claims that in contemporary Polish the dative is losing ground to

prepositional phrases that require other cases for reasons of linguistic economy and processing ease. If we look at the dative case suffixes in Polish, in fact, we immediately realize how linguistically heavy and complex they are compared to other cases, especially the accusative and the genitive, which almost always require less linguistic material. In certain instances, like the masculine singular, this contrast between the dative suffix *-owi* and the accusative and genitive *-a* is particularly evident. According to the author, whereas in some linguistic contexts the dative is necessary and irreplaceable, for example after verbs like *dać/dawać* (perfective and imperfective forms of ‘to give’), in cases in which other options are grammatically and semantically acceptable, for example when *dla* + genitive is a possible alternative, the speakers may decide to go for the simpler form because it is easier to articulate and to mentally process.

In a functional-typological approach, economy and processing ease are very important competing motivations cross-linguistically, that may favour a particular linguistic form over another in response to our predisposition to strive for the best result with the least effort, thus saving time, energy and intellectual resources. This universal human feature, which has been observed and studied in many cognitive domains and situations and in all human cultures and societies, may surely be an important reason why Polish speakers have turned to more analytical but linguistically simpler and more familiar means to express concepts that were otherwise rendered with the dative, thus simplifying their communicative task.

Even though, as I have written in Chapter 2, Russian and Polish have a very similar morphological structure, especially when it comes to nominal inflection, and their suffixes are often clearly recognizable if not identical, the Russian dative is phonetically simpler than the Polish dative overall and this may explain why my corpus shows a more extensive use of the dative in Russian than in Polish in opposition to *dla/dlja*. In contrast to Polish, the Russian masculine singular, for instance, takes only one vowel, *-u*, in the dative form and is therefore comparable to the genitive and accusative, that have the same suffix *-a* as Polish.

Another aspect worth stressing is that linguistic motivations and choices are not a matter of pure logics, therefore the outcome of a conflict or competition between different linguistic forms to express the same meaning in the same syntactical and semantic context cannot be foreseen and taken for granted once and for all. If languages surely respond to precise rational and functional, albeit unconscious, criteria, like the principle of economy and processing ease that we have seen before, there is also an important component of casualty and freedom in the historical development of languages. Human languages are, for a good part, the product of contingent conventions among communities of speakers. If it was not the case, all the languages of the world would be extremely similar, if not identical, at least from a grammatical point of view, which is definitely not what our empirical experience shows us.

The fact that Polish may prefer the prepositional phrase with *dla* or other prepositions over the simple dative case for the sake of simplicity is a result that can be noted, quantified and justified rationally as I have just done, but it should not be seen as an absolute necessity. Polish speakers could have nevertheless maintained or even increased the use of the more complex dative forms, and in fact they partly do it, since the dative can still be legitimately employed even when other options are possible (as the 14 samples of Polish dative in my corpus also demonstrate), in the same way they have maintained many other rather complicated grammatical and phonetic features that give this language a reputation of being tough to learn.

It should also be highlighted, once again, that the samples contained in the parallel section of the RNC and the occurrences collected for the sub-corpus that I am examining are too few in number and not enough varied from a socio-linguistical point of view to be statistically relevant and really representative of these two languages as a whole. So, we should not be tempted to draw broad-spectrum conclusions on their morphological and syntactic structure and innovation without the support of additional external resources.

5.3 Other prepositions

As we have seen in the previous paragraphs, the only other forms that I have found in competition with *dla/dlja* in the same semantic and syntactic environment, aside from the simple dative, are prepositional phrases introduced by another preposition. The number of occurrences of other prepositions in Russian in opposition to Polish *dla* is 30 out of 96, therefore almost 32%, whereas in Polish in opposition to Russian *dlja* the samples with preposition are the majority, almost 63%, with 23 occurrences out of 37.

The prepositions that I have found are different for the two languages and vary in proportion as well. I start by listing and quantifying them and then I will proceed with their detailed analysis. The Polish prepositions that we find in opposition to the Russian *dlja* are five: *do* (8 occurrences); *przeze* (1 occurrence); *na* (8 occurrences); *u* (5 occurrences); *w* (1 occurrence). The Russian prepositions, on the other hand, are eight: *radi* (13 occurrences); *po* (1 occurrence); *so/s* (2 occurrences); *u* (4 occurrences); *pered* (1 occurrence); *na* (4 occurrences); *za* (3 occurrences); *k* (2 occurrences).

The first thing to notice is that in both languages almost all the prepositions found in competition with *dla/dlja* have a spatial core meaning and are most typically used as spatial prepositions, whether static or dynamic, with different geometrical orientations, as we saw in the first chapter of this essay. Polish *do* is used to introduce the spatial destination of a towards movement; *przeze* is translatable as ‘through’ but can also express cause and agent complement, therefore the origin or source of the action; *na* and *w* have been largely discussed in Chapter 2; *u* indicates geographical proximity, like English ‘at’ or ‘by’. In Russian, *u* and *na* have the same meanings as in Polish; *k* introduces the spatial destination of a movement towards a destination like *do* in Polish; *so* is used to indicate provenance from open spaces or abstract situations as well as company or instrument; *pered* is widely used as a temporal preposition but has also the spatial meaning of ‘in front of’; *za*, as we have seen in Chapter 2, expresses cause but also the spatial meaning of ‘behind’,

and can occur with the meaning of ‘over’ or ‘out’, in other contexts; *po* is another highly polysemic preposition that conveys the spatial meanings of ‘along’ or ‘round’, among the others, but introduces also the complement of opinion, like “for me” in English. The only notable exception is the Russian preposition *radi*, which, as we will see in this paragraph, is translatable with ‘for’, like *dlja*, and occurs in many of the same contexts but has a much more restricted field of application than *dlja*.

First of all, I start analysing and commenting the samples containing the Polish prepositions used in opposition to Russian *dlja*. The highest numbers of occurrences are with *do* (8 samples) and *na* (8 samples) which, together, make more than half of the total 23 samples with alternative prepositions collected in the corpus. Let’s take an example with *do*:

(9) *У тебя* *есть* *что-нибудь* *для* *меня*
u tebj *est* *čto-nibud’* *dlja* *menja*
at PRON.2SG.GEN COP.3SG INDF for PRON.1SG.GEN
‘At you is (you have) something for me’

(10) *Masz* *coś* *do* *mnie*
Have.2SG INDF towards PRON.1SG.GEN
‘(You) have something towards me’²¹

In this case the participant introduced by *do* is the beneficiary, an animate that benefits from a gift or an offer probably, in this specific situation. In most of the occurrences with *do* (6 out of 8), however, we find an inanimate entity which plays the semantic role of purpose and represents the goal of an action or event, rather than an animate that takes benefits from the action.

²¹ Appendix sample (111)

(11) *He tema dlja obsuždeni-ja*
ne tema dlja obsuždeni-ja
 NEG topic.SG for discussion-GEN.SG
 ‘(It is) no topic for discussion’

(12) *To žaden temat do debat*
 DEM NEG topic.SG towards discussion.SG
 ‘This (is) no topic towards discussion’²²

In both cases, beneficiary and purpose, the denotatum introduced by *do* in contrast with the Russian preposition *dlja* is seen as the destination of the action, event or situation. The mental scenario that is evoked by this choice of words is, as it is often the case, a spatial path that, from the standing point of the speaker, moves towards the beneficiary or the purpose. If in *dlja* this mental representation is unveiled, in *do* it is made explicit, albeit unconsciously, by the speaker.

The preposition *na*, on the other hand, introduces all three roles of *iudicantis* (2 cases), purpose (5 cases) and beneficiary (1 case). The purpose role, like in the following example, is the most frequent one:

(13) *He vrema dlja diskusi-ŭ*
ne vremja dlja diskusi-j
 NEG time.SG for dispute-GEN.PL
 ‘No time for disputes’

(14) *Nie czas na dysput-y*

²² Appendix sample (128)

NEG time.SG to dispute-ACC.PL

‘No time to dispute’²³

The expression *czas + na*, ‘time to’ or ‘time for’, followed by the accusative is very common in Polish language (461,343 counts in Polish Web 2019 (plTenTen19))²⁴ and, as the employment of the accusative case rather than the locative suggests, it is associated to a dynamic movement towards something rather than a static spatial location. Once again, we are dealing with a representation of the action or event in which the purpose is seen as the end point of a dynamic, linear path.

The case of the beneficiary participant is similar to the previous one with *do* and it is not necessary to analyse it again, so I will show only one of the two instances of *iudicantis*:

(15) *Это чуточку высокогато для тебя*

èto čutočku vysokovato dlja tebjà

DEM INDF high.SG for PRON.2SG.GEN

‘This (is) a bit high for you’

(16) *To trochę za wysoko jak na ciebie*

DEM INDF too high.SG as to PRON.2SG.ACC

‘This (is) a bit too high as to you’²⁵

Here again the participant that undergoes the situation is seen as the passive end point of an action or event that does not depend on them and on which they have no power. In the overwhelming majority of the cases encountered in the RNC this participant is introduced by *dla* in Polish but, as I

²³ Appendix sample (127)

²⁴ These results were collected through the concordance function of plTenTen19 on February 25th, 2024

²⁵ Appendix sample (114)

mentioned before, individual variation in linguistic expression is frequent and, as long as it is perceived as grammatically and semantically coherent and does not violate any of the implicit language rules, acceptable.

A significant number of occurrences (5 out of 23) are with the preposition *u*, which, as we have seen before, conveys a spatial concept of proximity, vicinity, and can be roughly translated with the English prepositions ‘at’ or ‘by’. This preposition is used to indicate static location rather than motion.

- (17) *Необычн-ой* *для него* *искренност-и*
Neobyčn-oj *dlja nego* *iskprennost-i*
 unusual-GEN.SG for PRON.3SG.M.GEN sincerity-GEN.SG
 ‘Of unusual for him sincerity’

- (18) *Nienormaln-ej* *u niego* *szczerosc-i*
 unusual-GEN.SG at PRON.3SG.M.GEN sincerity-GEN.SG
 ‘Of unusual at him sincerity’²⁶

Of the 5 occurrences with *u*, 4 express the *iudicantis* and only 1 the beneficiary role. All of them concern an animate person. Unlike the *iudicantis* occurrences with the preposition *do*, where the participant was conceived as the end point of a dynamic path towards them, here they are seen as a motionless point to which a static state of affairs applies. If we look at the context in which these samples are found, we notice that in the occurrence (18) the topic of the discussion is the man and his character traits, whereas in (16) it is an external object, which is defined too high for the person in question. Seen this way, this difference makes more sense: if the topic and thus the attention of the

²⁶ Appendix sample (119)

speakers is on the *iudicantis* participant like in (18), then there is no relation and no figurative motion from an external entity, but if the attention is on an external object like in (16), then the relation with the *iudicantis* participant may be coded like a spatial dynamic path where the person is the end point of this figurative motion. The other 3 samples with *u* as *iudicantis* are very similar to (18) in this regard, like in the following case where, leaving aside the specific meaning of each word, the structure of the noun phrases is identical:

- (19) *C* *необычн-ой* *для него* *теплот-ой*
 s *neobyčn-oj* *dlja nego* *teplot-oj*
 with unusual-INSTR.SG for PRON.3SG.M.GEN warmth-INSTR.SG
 ‘With unusual warmth for him’

- (20) *Z* *rzadk-im* *u niego* *akcent-em* *serdeczność-i*
 with rare-INSTR.SG at PRON.3SG.M.GEN accent-INSTR.SG warmth-GEN.SG
 ‘With rare at him accent of warmth’²⁷

The last two prepositions that occur in Polish, with 1 occurrence each, are *w* and *przeze*, in the first case with the meaning of purpose and in the second case of beneficiary.

- (21) *Сколько* *рентабельн-ых* *для эксплуатации-и*
 skol'ko *rentabel'n-ych* *dlja eksploiataci-i*
 how much profitable-INSTR.PL for exploitation-GEN.SG
 ‘How much profitable for exploitation’

²⁷ Appendix sample (161)

- (22) *Ile opłacalnych w eksploatacj-i*
 how much profitable-INSTR.PL in exploitation-LOC.SG
 ‘How much profitable in the exploitation’²⁸

In this case with *w*, a static locative normally used to indicate closed areas, as we have seen in the first chapter, is employed to define and circumscribe the domain that corresponds to the purpose of the action in Russian. In Polish it is interpreted more as a restrictor than as purpose.

Lastly, we discuss the sample with *przeze* before moving to the Russian prepositions:

- (23) *He mog войти незаметно для меня*
ne mog vojti nezametno dlja menja
 NEG can.PST.3SG enter inadvertently for PRON.1SG.GEN
 ‘(He) could not enter inadvertently for me’

- (24) *Nie mógł wejść nie zauważ-ony przeze mnie*
 NEG can.PST.3SG.M enter NEG notice- PTCP.M through PRON.1SG.GEN
 ‘(He) could not enter not noticed by me’²⁹

This latter with *przeze* is a borderline case because the grammatical structure is not identical in Russian (23) and Polish (24): if Russian *dlja* introduces the beneficiary of the action of entering quietly, Polish resorts to the agent complement and eliminates the beneficiary role completely. The adverb *nezametno*, ‘inadvertently, that we find in Russian, is translated into Polish with the past participle of the verb *zauważyć*, ‘to notice’. The past participle in Polish, like in many other Indo-

²⁸ Appendix sample (120)

²⁹ Appendix sample (112)

European language, behaves morphologically like an adjective and its status is hybrid: preceded by an auxiliary, whether explicit or omitted, it can be part of a passive form verbal compound, but it can also join a noun compound like the adjectives of non-verbal origin. In this case the position in the sentence and the presence of the agent complement introduced by *przeze* testify the verbal nature of the element *zauważony*. For this reason, this particular sample is a borderline case that I have included in the corpus but may have been left out following a stricter application of the conditions discussed in the previous chapter.

Now that I have discussed all the Polish prepositions in competition with *dla/dlja*, let us examine the Russian prepositions that I have encountered in the corpus.

Two of the prepositions, as I mentioned at the beginning of this paragraph, are the equivalent of the already encountered and commented Polish *na* and *u*, which have 4 occurrences each in Russian. I start with the simpler case, *na*, which not only introduces the beneficiary role in all 4 samples, but also always occurs after the very same verb, *rabotat'*, ‘to work’, with the meaning of “working towards/for somebody”. As the very high number of counts for the expression *rabotat' na* in Russian Web 2017 (ruTenTen17), exactly 575,137³⁰, proves, this seems to be a very widespread lexical combination. Let us take one of these instances:

(25) *Pracowałem dla ciebie*
 Work.PST.1SG.M for PRON.2SG.GEN
 ‘(I) worked for you’

(26) *Я работал на тебя*
ja rabotal na tebjja
 PRON.1SG work.PST.M to PRON.2SG.ACC

³⁰ These results were collected through the concordance function of ruTenTen17 on February 26th, 2024

‘I worked to you’³¹

Unlike Polish, in which the preposition *na* introduced all three semantic roles in different contexts and the most represented one was the purpose, in Russian it seems circumscribed to the beneficiary role for a human participant and to this specific verb. The preposition *na* is not the subject of this essay, so I will not examine it in depth, but it would be interesting to do further research on this subject with the aid of other corpora and data resources.

The preposition *u* requires supplementary considerations because, as it is very well known, it also marks the possessive in Russian. As a matter of fact, in Russian, unlike in Polish, the possessive adjectives have receded, displaying as a consequence a less wide distribution. Furthermore, the typically Indo-European possessive constructions with the possessor in the nominative form, the verb ‘to have’ and the possessed in the accusative form are replaced by constructions with the verb *est’*, ‘to be’, the possessed in the nominative form and the possessor in a prepositional phrase introduced by *u*, which, as we have seen, has the spatial meaning of proximity. Possession in Russian is therefore clearly conceived as the spatial permanence of the possessed on the area surrounding the possessor. This imaginary area is what Dąbrowska (1997) calls “personal sphere”, that is, the sets objects, people, affections, facts, situations and so on, strictly associated with a specific individual which can be modified, increased or decreased, by the action of an external agent. The beneficiary or experiencer codified by dative-compound or by other means like the prepositional phrase with *dla/dlja*, is in Dąbrowska (1997)’s argument the possessor of the personal sphere who is liable to be advantaged or disadvantaged by an external and involuntary variation of their personal area. Now we can more clearly identify the close semantic association between the concept of possession, the beneficiary and the experiencer roles and the setting of spatial proximity.

³¹ Appendix sample (85)

Coming back to the samples of our corpus, the 4 occurrences with Russian *u* all express the *iudicantis* role. Because of the peculiar way in which the possessive is formed in Russian and the contiguity, if not overlapping, of the *iudicantis* and the possession concepts, sometimes it is not possible to objectively determine once and for all whether the prepositional phrase could or should be viewed and translated as a possessive or not. As usual, I will translate the following samples in the most literal way without recurring to a possessive construct.

(27) *Dzisiaj niezwykły dla mnie dzień*
 today unusual.SG for PRON.1SG.GEN day.SG
 ‘Today (is) for me (an) unusual day’

(28) *Сегодня у меня замечательный день*
segodnja u menja zamečatel’nyj den’
 today at PRON.1SG.GEN unusual.SG day.SG
 ‘Today (is) at me (an) unusual day’³²

It is hard to decide how the Russian sample (28) should be translated. The literal translation provided is certainly ungrammatical in English and, in any case, it should be reformulated to be linguistically acceptable. Both a sentence with the preposition “for” that matches the Polish version with *dla*, where only the preposition changes, and a possessive statement such a “Today I have an unusual day” would be, in fact, appropriate translations in this context and the choice between the two options is more a matter of subjective and stylistic taste. As I have mentioned already several times in this essay, very often simple and complex linguistic means in different languages do not align, therefore it is impossible to establish a univocal and incontrovertible correspondence between them.

³² Appendix sample (84)

In other cases, like the following one, because of the word order and the nature and position of the verb in Russian, a possessive can easily be excluded:

(29) *Pojawiła się dla niego szansa*
 Appear.PST.3SG.F REFL for PRON.3SG.M.GEN chance.SG
 ‘Chance appeared for him’

(30) *У него появилась возможность*
и него появилась’ *возможность*
 at PRON.3SG.M.GEN appear-PST-3SG.F-REFL opportunity.SG
 ‘To him opportunity appeared’³³

Let us continue with the other prepositions. The preposition *k*, which occurs in 2 samples, has a meaning comparable to *do* in Polish, ‘to’ or ‘towards’ a destination. In one case it introduces a beneficiary, in the other a maleficiary participant but, in both cases, it is a feeling that is directed towards the human recipient.

(31) *pod wpływ-em współczuci-a dla niego*
 under influence-LOC.SG pity-GEN.SG for PRON.3SG.M.GEN
 ‘Under (the) influence of pity for him’

(32) *под влияни-ем сочувстви-я к нему*
pod vlijan-em sočuvstvi-ja k nemu
 under influence-PREP.SG sympathy-GEN.SG towards PRON.3SG.M.DAT

³³ Appendix sample (96)

‘Under (the) influence of sympathy towards him’³⁴

It is not necessary to examine the other case because it is very similar to (31) and (32), even though the recipient is a maleficiary one towards whom a feeling of hatred is addressed. The setting created and evoked in the speakers’ minds is the same we have seen when analysing *do* in Polish: in this case the feeling towards a person, like in English and in many other languages, is conceived as a path or an object traveling on a path that ends when it reaches the recipient, having the recipient as its final goal and destination. This construction with feeling + *k* seems to be very successful in Russian because, if we translate the expression “hatred for” in different online dictionaries and translators, such as Bing Translator³⁵ or Reverso³⁶, all results we obtain, at least in the first page, are *nenavist’ k*, ‘hatred towards’. The same thing happens when translating “love for”, *lyubov’ k*, ‘love towards’ giving us a further confirmation that this preposition is preferential in this context in Russian.

Za, meaning ‘behind’, but also ‘out’ and ‘over, among the many functions it can cover, occurs 3 times in total, in 2 samples introducing beneficiary and in the remaining one purpose. First of all, we have one of the samples with a beneficiary participant:

(33) *Wojowali* *dla niego*
fight.PST.3PL.M for PRON.3SG.M.GEN
‘(They) fought for him’

(34) *Боева-л-и* *за* *него*
voevali *za* *nego*
fight-PST-PL.M behind PRON.3SG.M.ACC

³⁴ Appendix sample (95)

³⁵ <https://www.bing.com/translator>, results collected on February 27th, 2024

³⁶ <https://context.reverso.net/translation/english-russian/hatred+for>, results collected on February 27th, 2024

‘(They) fought behind him’³⁷

As I have said before, linguistic elements, especially prepositions and other extremely flexible and polysemic items, are not semantically fixed, this is why it is often not easy to find the most proper translation in other languages. If both “behind” and “over” could be used to translate the preposition *za*, as well as “for” in the translation provided for (33), in this instance, since the role of beneficiary is made clear by the Polish text, I preferred “behind” instead than “over”, which, in English, would have attributed to the participant the role of object of the dispute, rather than of beneficiary. The act of fighting to the benefit of the recipient can be imagined as fighting “behind him”, therefore “covering his back”, a popular turn of words in many languages to be interpreted literally or referred to more abstract or general situations in which the beneficiary is supported and defended against external threats, whether physical or psychological.

Moreover, we shall not forget that the preposition *za* introduces cause as well, in Polish and in Russian, as we have seen in Chapter 2, and the beneficiary of the fighting in this sample could also be viewed as the motivation, thus the cause, of the action as well as the recipient. In the only case of Polish *dla* with meaning of purpose, *za* can even more easily be interpreted as purpose or cause in the Russian counterpart:

(35) *Dla towarzystw-a popłakala się matka*
for company-GEN.SG PRF.cry.PST.3SG.F REFL mother.SG
‘Mother cried for company’

(36) *За компани-ю поплакала мать*
За компани-ю poplakala mat’

³⁷ Appendix sample (99)

over company-ACC.SG PRF-cry-PST-SG.F mother.SG

‘Mother cried over company’³⁸

In this case, since the participant preceded by *dla* in Polish and *za* in Russian cannot possibly be a beneficiary being inanimate, it can be conceived as the purpose of the action of crying, more specifically if the speaker wants to highlight the willingness and the hope of the mother to obtain a positive result through her crying, making it an aimed, purposeful action, like in the Polish case (35) with *dla*. In Russian, on the other hand, this sense of purpose is not linguistically expressed and the speaker is rather focusing on the (lack of) company being the cause of the woman’s crying, rather than her desired goal.

S and its longer form *so*, in Russian, is used to convey the sematic role of company or instrument, being these two concepts very closely associated from a cognitive and thus linguistic point of view in the languages of the world, as many studies in Cognitive Linguistics have widely proved but also, as we have seen before, to indicate provenance. In 2 samples of the corpus, we find them in opposition to the Polish preposition *dla* and in both they express the beneficiary role.

(37) *Być dla ciebie uprzejm-a*

be for PRON.2SG.GEN polite-SG.F

‘Be polite for you’

(38) *Быть с тобой любезн-ой*

byt’ s toboj liubeznoy-oj

be with PRON.2SG.INSTR polite-SG.M

³⁸ Appendix sample (106)

‘Be polite with you’³⁹

Constructions that express a particular feeling or attitude towards someone often make use of the preposition “with”, thus marking it linguistically as a comitative. It is not an uncommon phenomenon, cross-linguistically. Also in English, expressions like “being polite with” or “being nasty with” can be legitimately used as alternatives for “being polite to” and “being nasty to”, which in turn codify the situation as a movement of feelings and actions towards the beneficiary. Both options are equally acceptable and their difference merely corresponds to a different semantic nuance. Whereas in (37) *dla* highlights that the speaker is polite to the benefit of the recipient, thus marking the positive effect intended to be produced on them, in (38) this act is seen as being polite “in the company of” the recipient, thus marking the fact that the speaker is polite in the presence of the recipient, without making their benefit explicit.

The prepositions *pered* and *po* occur only one time each. *Pered* conveys the spatial meaning of ‘in front of’ and in the sample it introduces a beneficiary participant:

(39) *Za zaslug-i* *dla król-a*
 for service-ACC.PL for king-GEN.SG
 ‘For services for (the) king’

(40) *За заслуг-и* *перед* *корол-ем*
 za zaslug-i *pered* *korol-em*
 for service-ACC.PL in front of king-PREP.SG
 ‘For services in front of (the) king’⁴⁰

³⁹ Appendix sample (88)

⁴⁰ Appendix sample (110)

The preposition *pered*, ‘in front of’ after *zaslugi*, ‘services’, that suggest a moral commitment vis-à-vis something or somebody, seems to be widely employed in Russian. In Russian Web 2017 (ruTenTen17) the combination *zaslugi pered* occurs 17,720 times⁴¹, followed by a very specific and restricted set of words like *Otečestom*, ‘Fatherland’, *gorodom*, ‘city’, *narodom*, ‘people’, *regionom*, ‘region’, thus mostly geographical nouns with a clear political or even moral connotation in this context. The scenarios evoked by these descriptions are formal and ceremonious and the services offered to the king, to the country or to the population are seen more as highly valuable actions following an ethical engagement than part of a simple commercial transaction. The imaginary frontal position of the agent in relation to the beneficiary mirrors therefore the position of the person who, in front of an audience or a royal seat, solemnly commits themselves to serve and act in their behalf and interest.

The sample with *po* seems to express *iudicantis* role, even though the surrounding linguistic context provided by the RNC is not sufficient to establish it with certitude.

(41) *Dla mnie mogą sobie husyc-i przyjmować*
 for PRON.1SG.GEN can.3PL REFL hussite-PL accept
 ‘For me the Hussites can accept’

(42) *По мне так пусть гусит-ы принимают*
po мне tak pust’ gusit-y prinimajut
 for PRON.1SG.DAT so IMP hussite-PL accept.3PL
 ‘For me so let the Hussites accept’⁴²

⁴¹ These results were collected through the concordance function of ruTenTen17 on February 28th, 2024

⁴² Appendix sample (82)

The element that made me lean towards an interpretation of the first-person participant as a *iudicantis*, rather than a beneficiary, is the preposition *po* in Russian followed by the pronoun, which typically introduces an opinion, as all the translations of *po mne* provided in Reverso ⁴³ and the occurrences found in Russian Web 2017 (ruTenTen17) ⁴⁴ also attest. We have seen in Chapter 2 that also the preposition *dla*, followed by a sentient human experiencer, is widely used to express opinion and feeling, in Russian and Polish like in many other Indo-European languages, but other means to express this concept are also available.

Now we come to the last preposition I have found in competition with *dla* with most occurrences (13 out of 30), but perhaps the least interesting for us from a cognitive point of view: *radi*. In almost all the samples (12) it conveys the beneficiary role, whereas in the remaining case it could be interpreted as purpose or as beneficiary depending on how we understand the reference noun, as I will shortly explain. We see one of the examples of beneficiary first, and then, in (45) and (46), the ambiguous case.

(43) *Zrobiliśmy to dla ciebie*
 PFV.do.PST.M.2PL DEM for PRON.2SG.GEN
 ‘(We) did it for you’

(44) *Мы делал-и это ради тебя*
 my delali èto radi tebjá
 PRON.1PL do.PST.PL DEM for PRON.2SG.GEN
 ‘We did it for you’⁴⁵

⁴³ <https://context.reverso.net/translation/russian-english/> По+ мне, results collected on February 28th, 2024

⁴⁴ These results were collected through the concordance function of ruTenTen17 on February 28th, 2024

⁴⁵ Appendix sample (86)

This case is clear and straightforward, as the second person pronoun indicates without doubts that the participant is animate, most probably human, and is the beneficiary of some positive action undertaken especially for them which is not specified here. The next samples leave more room for interpretation:

(45) *Dla dobr-a kraj-u wyrzeknijcie się*
 for good.GEN.SG country-GEN.SG give up.2PL REFL
 ‘For (the) good of the country you give up’

(46) *Ради блага стран-ы откажитесь*
radi blaga stran-y otkažite-s’
 for good.GEN.SG country-GEN.SG give up.2PL-REFL
 ‘For (the) good of the country you give up’⁴⁶

The decision between beneficiary and purpose here depends on whether we see the country, for the benefit of which the action is taken, as an inanimate object or concept or if we, on the contrary, understand it as a group of people, therefore as a collective noun denoting human beings. In the first case, the good of the object “country” represents the purpose of the action, in the second case the humans making up the country and benefitting from the action are the beneficiaries.

Now that I have clarified this, I will examine the meaning and distribution of *radi* in contrast to *dla/dlja*. Gančikov (2004: 174) in her grammar book translates the preposition *radi* with the Italian correspondents of ‘for the sake of’, ‘for the love of’, thus stressing heavily the positive effect of the action for the beneficiary and the strong motivation of the agent to act with the solely purpose to

⁴⁶ Appendix sample (105)

benefit them. In the article dedicated to the preposition *dlja*, which is included in Apresjan’s Active dictionary of the Russian language (ADR), Levontina (2003: 272) writes that, compared to the preposition *dlja*, *radi* stresses the motivation of the action, making the connection between the action and the agent less direct. In case of *radi* the outcome of the action is therefore prevalent and the focus of the speakers is more on the result of the action, therefore on the benefit for the recipient, rather than on the action itself.

Contrary to the other prepositions we have seen so far in this chapter, *radi* has no other application than the beneficiary role, to whom the action is specifically aimed. As a matter of fact, at the beginning of this paragraph we have noticed that it is the only preposition that does not have any spatial function and, in our samples, it always introduces an animate participant. It cannot be used with the semantic role of *iudicantis* nor to indicate an inanimate purpose. Even in the role of beneficiary, *radi* has a more limited distribution than *dlja* and cannot be interchanged with the latter in all the contexts with beneficiary. Apresjan (1995), for instance, points out that *radi* cannot be used with the indefinite pronoun *vse*, ‘everything’ to convey certain interpretations that are possible with *dlja* instead, like in the following examples provided by the author and slightly simplified by me here:

(47) Он делает все для меня
 on delaet vse dlja menja
 PRON.3SG do.3SG INDF for PRON.1SG.GEN
 ‘He does everything for me’

(48) Он делает все ради меня
 on delaet vse radi menja
 PRON.3SG do.3SG INDF for PRON.1SG.GEN
 ‘He does everything for me’

In (47), with *dlja*, two interpretations are possible: that the agent does everything he can for me or that whatever he does is for me. In (48), with *radi*, only the second interpretation, which stresses particularly the beneficiary element, is admissible. More detailed analysis of *radi* in opposition to *dlja* are provided in many essays on this subject, but for our purpose it is sufficient what we have noted so far.

In the following paragraph I will briefly summarize and compare the findings that I have commented throughout this chapter before moving to the very last chapter of this thesis.

5.4 Final overview

Let us go back to Chart 1 and Chart 2 in this chapter, section 5.1. If we look at the numbers, we notice some important details. In the first place, in our corpus Russian resorts much more often to alternative linguistic means to Polish preposition *dla* (96 total occurrences) than Polish to Russian preposition *dlja* (37 total occurrences).

Russian uses the simple dative in more than 68% of the cases, the majority of which expresses the *iudicantis* (more than 68% of the datives) and the remaining cases (almost 32%) the beneficiary/maleficiary role. All these cases with the simple dative concern animate and more typically human participants, who are sentient beings cognitively able to experience states and emotions and have opinions (*iudicantis* role) and to be personally favoured or penalized by an external action (beneficiary/maleficiary role). In Polish, on the other hand, the simple datives are a minority of the corpus (a bit more than 37%), but we find them in the same roles as in Russian, with similar proportions (more than 78% in the *iudicantis* and the remaining approximate 21% in the beneficiary role).

The other prepositions are more numerous in Russian (30 occurrences) than in Polish (23 occurrences) in absolute numbers, but they are prevalent as percentage in Polish (more than 62%),

which has much less occurrences in general, and a minority (around 31%) in Russian. The prepositions cover all three semantic roles identified in the corpus in both languages, with individual differences due to the semantic value and application of each preposition. In Polish they occur more often with the purpose role (more than 52%), thus preceding an inanimate entity that represents the goal of the action, whereas in Russian the beneficiary is definitely overrepresented (exactly 70% of the cases) due to the many samples with the preposition *radi* which can convey this meaning only.

In this chapter I have mentioned in which other contexts the simple dative and the collected prepositions can occur and attempted to explain why, from a linguistic and cognitive point of view, they can be expected to appear in place of the preposition *dla/dlja* in the samples examined. As I have already mentioned in the paragraph concerning the simple dative and as other more targeted empirical researches on the subject may show, these competing forms, simple dative and prepositions, are by no means a normative necessity nor the only possible alternative to *dla/dlja*. In many cases *dla/dlja* could have been used like in their correspondent parallel text that contained it. As a matter of fact, that was the case more often than not, since the majority of the texts that I found and scanned on the RNC contained *dla/dlja* in both languages and have therefore been excluded. Sometimes other prepositions could have been employed as well. For example, in the sentence (34) the preposition *radi* instead of *za*, thus *Voevali radi nego* instead of *Voevali za nego*, would be equally acceptable from a grammatical and semantic point of view and the translator's decision to use *za* in this context and not *dlja* or *radi* was a contingent and optional choice. A choice that was grammatically and semantically motivated, as my analysis should have proven, but not obligatory.

We have seen that the choice of one preposition or case over the other means available in the same syntactic and lexical context is often a matter of expressive priorities of the competent speaker, who, in a range of possible semantic nuances and ways to represent the same event, decides to focus an element over the other, like Russian *radi* over *dlja* to stress the beneficiary more than the action itself or Polish *do* instead of *dla* to convey the very effective path metaphor. By selecting one form over the others, the speakers describe the situation from the point of view that is most congenial to

them in that moment. It is therefore a subjective matter, which concerns the individual speaker, besides being linguistically motivated.

In the next and final chapter of this thesis I draw some general conclusions on the polysemy and adaptability of the linguistic items, their *raison d'être* and their motivations on the basis of the conceptual framework of Cognitive Linguistics.

6. Conclusions from the point of view of Cognitive Linguistics

Language typology and research on linguistic universals have shown remarkable similarities among the languages of the world when it comes to their general structure and functioning.

More specifically, the different strategies that different languages employ for everyday communication have been depicted as the outcome of three competing motivations working simultaneously against each other and resulting in a relatively stable compromise, which is nevertheless always liable to swing to one side or the other during the course of historical language development and variation. I have briefly mentioned two of these competing forces in the simple dative paragraph 5.2 of Chapter 5: the principle of language economy, which motivates the speakers to convey the meaning in the most efficient way with the least waste of time and energy, and the principle of processing ease, which motivates the speakers to convey the meaning with the least cognitive, articulatory and mnemonic effort. The third competing motivation is the principle of iconicity, which motivates the speakers to employ linguistic means that in some way mimic and mirror the physical reality of the entity or phenomenon that is being described in the linguistic event. Despite being in opposition against each other sometimes, as, for instance, an economical linguistic strategy that requires a quantitative reduction of linguistic material may not be the most iconic and vice versa, these three principles are also linked to each other and often overlap. An iconic solution, for instance, can be beneficial to the processing ease motivation as well, as it may be easier to remember for the speakers and thus require less mnemonic effort, and so could be an economical solution, which, by saving energy and time, would also contribute to ease the language processing as a whole.

The central Cognitive Linguistics theory, namely the statement that language means are created on the basis of the physical experience of the speakers in their physical environment and are thus connected to other cognitive human functions such as perception, association and categorization, is compatible to these three principles and demonstrates how the languages of the world apply them concretely. Indeed, the fact that language is created on the basis of the concrete and physical experience of the speaker responds to all three motivations. Firstly, to the principle of economy, because leading back even the more abstract linguistic concepts to the physical reality directly experienced by the speaker saves the time and energy that would be necessary to create brand-new ones. Secondly, to the principle of processing ease, because it is much simpler to process and remember the elements that make up our much more familiar physical environment than completely new ones. Lastly, to the principle of iconicity, because the associations made between the physical entities and events and the more abstract concepts that human languages can convey are motivated on the basis of analogies and similarities.

As Lakoff and Johnson (1980) have shown, metaphor, that is, the symbolic replacement of one proper item with a figurative one on the basis of similarity, is not merely an occasional stylistic embellishment, but rather the very core of human language production and all human speakers resort to this cognitive operation unconsciously in their everyday communicative interactions. Treading the most abstract concepts and events on physical phenomena is therefore an absolute constant in language creation because it mirrors the way our human brain is designed to work, namely in the most economical, sparing and efficient way. Kahneman (2011) and other cognitive psychologists have proven with numerous experiments and observations that humans are led by their own neurobiological characteristics to continuously find shortcuts to solve their everyday cognitive problems in spite of the accuracy of processing, otherwise the resources and the time required to process the input would be excessive and incompatible with our own survival.

Every cognitive operation is thus a simplification of the physical stimuli we concretely experience every day. First of all, in order to understand and organize reality, we need to extract the most significant features of the objects that compose it, group and classify them. In the Seventies, Rosch has revolutionized cognitive sciences introducing the theory of prototypes, which are not static and fixed categories the way Western philosophy and psychology have traditionally depicted them starting from Aristoteles, but rather dynamic classes built around the most salient and frequent member people can think of, the so-called prototype. According to the theory of prototypes, the items that belong to a category do not all possess the same equal status, but are considered more or less typical depending on their closeness to the prototype. For instance, an apple will be considered a more typical fruit than a lychee by a European individual, because in Europe apples are more common and consequently more familiar than lychees. In the same way, a tomato will hardly be the first fruit named because it lacks sweetness, which, for being a feature possessed by most fruits, increases the “fruitness” of the item in question. We can see how this way to interpret and classify reality responds to a necessity of cognitive economy and how it is applicable to linguistics as well, since the main task of languages is to simplify and classify the heterogeneity of the world which we inhabit in order to name objects and relations.

If the physical and imaginary items that make up our experience are potentially infinite, the sounds and phonetic sequences that our brain can identify, process and remember without hindering its functions are limited. This is the reason why we label different individual items with the same phonetical combination, such as “house” for all buildings that have certain characteristics, when we group them in the same category, and this is also why the same word can convey different meanings depending on the context in which it is found.

Following this reasoning, polysemy is a central and constant aspect of all, or almost all, language elements and not an eccentric peculiarity of a tiny fraction of our vocabulary, contrary to what traditional linguists used to think. Polysemy is a feature that is particularly evident in more

grammatical classes of elements like prepositions, as we have seen throughout this essay, but concerns in different degrees all linguistic items, nouns included. Like all Rosch's categories, also linguistic items have more and less prototypical meanings. The most prototypical meaning is the one we normally associate to the linguistic item in question because it is the most frequent or familiar, like the four-legged and furred pet when we hear the word "dog" out of context. The least prototypical meaning, on the other hand, is the one that applies to rarer and more specific contexts only, like a morally questionable person when we use the same word as an insult. The reason why we can use the word "dog" to vilify someone who clearly is not the four-legged and furred pet normally denoted by this noun is that our lexical resources are limited and word recycling and reusing are the rule, far from being the exception. This operation is justified by the fact that we spot a similarity between the animal and the person without moral values. Once again, we start from our most immediate physical experience, namely the four-legged pet in this case, to denote a more abstract concept, a morally inappropriate behaviour. In other cultures, in which the animal dog is highly valued, on the other hand, this label may be used with a totally opposite meaning and people may be denigrated by calling them other animals' names. Prototypicality is thus a cultural and conventional matter, at least up to a certain point, like languages in general.

With prepositions, in particular with the Russian and Polish prepositions I have examined in this thesis, the same principle applies but in a subtler way. As grammatical items, prepositions do not denote specific object, whether physical or imaginary, but relations. Despite that, they also have meanings and, like other linguistic classes such as nouns, they have more and less prototypical meanings. Before discussing it further, let us take one of the Polish examples that I have examined in the previous chapter:

(1) *Masz coś do mnie*

Have.2SG INDF towards PRON.1SG.GEN

‘(You) have something towards me’⁴⁷

As we have seen, the preposition *do* is mainly a spatial preposition with dynamic meaning that introduces the semantic role of destination of a motion, like in the following sentence:

(2) *Idę do dom-u*
go.1SG towards home-GEN.SG
‘(I) go home’

As any Polish speaker would say, (2) is one of the most typical cases in which the preposition *do* is found. However, in example (1), it is used as a replacement for the preposition *dla*, which is present in the parallel Russian translation of the corpus and could be used in Polish as well, as the similar number of occurrences between expressions like *coś do mnie* and *coś dla mnie* (212 and 206 counts respectively) in Polish Web 2019 (plTenTen19)⁴⁸, ‘something for me’, shows. The context described in (1) is a donation of something to a recipient, which plays the role of beneficiary. As I have explained in Chapter 5, the setting evoked in the speaker’s mind in (1) is a gift travelling on a path that goes from the donating agent to the receiving beneficiary. This latter is not the most prototypical application of the proposition *do*, but the speaker sees a similarity between the situation (2), in which the agent physically moves on a trajectory that leads them home, and the situation (1), in which the physical or abstract entity that is being given to the recipient is imagined traveling on a trajectory as well while being transferred from the donor to the beneficiary. This is an example of a Polish preposition, *do*, displaying a polysemic behaviour.

⁴⁷ Appendix sample (111)

⁴⁸ These results were collected through the concordance function of plTenTen19 on March 5th, 2024

The same concept can be tracked in the other samples of my corpus. It is not necessary to reanalyse all of them here, but I propose a couple of additional examples to better illustrate my position.

(3) *быть с тобой любезн-ой*
byt' s toboj liubeznoj-oj
be with PRON.2SG.INSTR polite-SG.M
'Be polite with you'⁴⁹

The Russian preposition *s*, in (3) does not literally mean 'in the company of', 'together with' which is its most frequent and prototypical meaning, as in the following sentence:

(4) *Я ужинаю с тобой*
ja użinaju s toboj
PRON.1SG dine.1S with PRON.2SG.INSTR
'I have dinner with you'

In case (4), the agent is undertaking the action of having dinner with the participant expressed by the comitative. They both are doing something together, keeping each other company. It is not the case of (3), where the agent is addressing their positive feeling and behaviour to the recipient, which, in contrast to (3), does not participate to the action but is rather subjected to it without having the possibility to exercise any control. Even though the agentivity level of the beneficiary introduced by *s* in (4) is much lower than the comitative of the sentence (3), the speaker spots a similarity once again, which is linguistically revealed by the employment of the same grammatical means: in (4) the

⁴⁹ Appendix sample (88)

agent is polite towards and to the benefit of a passive recipient, but it also happens in their presence and company, like in (3). Here again the same preposition is used to convey different semantic roles and meanings, some of them more prototypical, some of them relegated to more specific contexts.

In this last example the Polish preposition *u*, which typically expresses a static locative, is used to restrict a statement to the *iudicantis* participant.

- (5) *Nienormaln-ej u niego szczeróśc-i*
 unusual-GEN.SG at PRON.3SG.M.GEN sincerity-GEN.SG
 ‘Of unusual at him sincerity’⁵⁰

A more prototypical use of the preposition would be like in sentence (6):

- (6) *Mieszkam u mojej babc-i*
 live.1SG at POSS.1SG-GEN.SG grandmother-GEN.SG
 ‘I live at my grandmother’s (house)’

In Polish, *u* expresses in the first place the physical location in somebody’s own place and can be roughly translated with the English preposition ‘at’ or ‘by’. This situation is expressed literally in sentence (6), in which the speaker claims to be living in their grandmother’s house, but not in (5), where an abstract characteristic, namely being sincere, is said not to be usual for the individual of which they speak. Even though the scenarios are completely different in every regard, the speaker sees once again a similarity: the *iudicantis* in (5) is like a static place in which sincerity is rarely to be found. Since *u* is employed mostly with animates, this association is particularly fitting. This is a very striking example of how the human brain is capable of turning a very concrete setting, namely

⁵⁰ Appendix sample (119)

being physically at somebody's house, into an extremely abstract one in order to express invisible and intangible concepts, in this case a moral characteristic.

We have seen that speakers can use more or less prototypical means to express the same meanings. All these prepositions have been found in competition with *dla/dlja* and in most of the cases I analysed in my corpus their replacement with *dla/dlja* would be possible, even if *dla/dlja* could be considered contrived by native speakers in certain contexts when it has fallen out of use or, more generally, another preposition is conventionally preferred. Why does the speaker resort to less typical uses of other prepositions, like Polish *do* to express beneficiary even though it is mainly used to convey spatial destination, if the preposition *dla/dlja* is readily available?

The first reason is that the human brain tends to codify more abstract and complex experiences with the same grammatical and lexical means used to describe physical and concrete events. Depicting a beneficiary or a *iudicantis* participant with spatial terms reflects the way the speaker, in a completely unconscious way, imagines the event. Secondly, thinking and talking metaphorically should not be considered a rare skill of few talented individuals but rather the norm and this leads to using less conventional linguistic means to think and communicate concepts. This predisposition to reinterpret our limited range of linguistic tools and use them in a creative way is the very basis of language evolution, from grammaticalization to lexical variation.

The other competing form that we have examined in Chapter 5, section 5.2., is the simple dative. As many scholars, especially in the field of Cognitive Linguistics, have highlighted in the last decades, cases are not just empty grammatical categories. If they do not denote an identifiable entity the way nouns typically do, they can nevertheless convey meanings, more specifically relational meanings. Alone or with the aid of an apposition, cases assign semantic roles to the participants and thus contribute to build the logical hierarchy of the communication event. The roles expressed by the datives in our samples are in no way less meaningful than their prepositional counterparts.

As Haspelmath (2006) recalls, cases are often differentiated in grammatical and concrete cases. Grammatical cases mostly mark core arguments and express syntactic relations, like subject or object, whereas concrete cases convey a wider range of semantic roles, like spatial meanings, and mostly mark peripheral elements. This is not a cross-linguistically valid and rigid classification, but rather a gradual scale that, depending on the specific language and context of application, may assign a case in one group or the other.

As a marker of indirect object, the dative, in Russian, Polish and other European languages with nominal inflection like German, is often found as a core argument, in combination with certain verbs like “to give” (*dać/dawać* in Polish and *dat’/davat’* in Russian), which necessarily require it to complete their meaning. Another example that we have seen in Chapter 5, section 5.2, is the case of the Polish verb *podobać* and Russian *nravit’sja*, ‘to like’, where the presence of the experiencer is obligatory and always marked with the dative case. No other linguistic means are possible in these cases and replacing them with *dla/dlja* or any other prepositional phrase would be considered grammatically unacceptable. In our samples, however, the dative identifies either the beneficiary or, in the majority of cases, the *iudicantis* role and is not obligatory, because it marks an adjunct. Omitting the participant in the dative case or the prepositional phrase with *dla/dlja* that is found in the corresponding parallel text would result in a less informative statement but would nevertheless be completely grammatical, like in (8):

- (7) *Закажите мне лучше коньяк-у*
zakažite mne lučše kon’jak-u
 order.IMP.2PL PRON.1SG.DAT better cognac-ACC.SG
 ‘Better order (to) me cognac’⁵¹

⁵¹ Appendix sample (4)

(8) *Закажите лучше коньяк-у*
zakažite lučše kon'jak-u
 order.IMP.2PL better cognac-ACC.SG
 ‘Better order cognac’

In contrast to the verbs *dać/dawać, dat'/davat', podobać* and *nравит'сja*, the verb *zakažit'*, ‘to order’, is not grammatically tied to a participant marked with the dative case and this confers to the speaker a greater freedom when it comes to the choice of alternative linguistic forms. The same applies when the simple dative marks the *iudicantis* role in a nominal predicate, like in sentences (9) and (10):

(9) *Jej będzie lepiej*
 PRON.3SG.F.DAT COP.FUT.3SG better
 ‘To her (it) will be better’⁵²

(10) *Będzie lepiej*
 COP.FUT.3SG better
 ‘(It) will be better’

As I have explained in Chapter 5, the choice of one means or another in these cases is more a matter of linguistic nuance than a normative necessity. In the samples of my corpus, in which *dla/dlja* is replaced with the simple dative case, the event and the participants of the events are the same. What changes is the focus of the speaker. As we saw in Chapter 5, section 5.2, Aprasjan et al. (2023) claim that with the preposition *dla/dlja* the focus is on the action itself, whereas the dative highlights the

⁵² Appendix sample (74)

position of the beneficiary/*iudicantis* participant. Both options are linguistically possible, but in the first case the element introduced by *dla/dlja* becomes more peripheral and accessory than the participant marked with the dative, even though both could be omitted without making the statement ungrammatical.

As the occurrences that I have collected and examined throughout this essay should have demonstrated, languages are bound to rules, dictated by logical and semantic constraints as well as arbitrary habits and conventions, which allow some forms and combinations and exclude others, but they also leave a significant space for individual freedom. This explains the variations we observe in individual productions of speakers who belong to the same linguistic community as well as among different languages, both synchronically and diachronically.

Linguistic forms that mirror the way our brain processes reality and builds abstract concepts that is, along the lines of our everyday concrete experiences, often turn out to be particularly successful, as we have seen especially in the case of prepositions. In particular, prepositional elements with a prototypical spatial meaning, which is highly based on our physical experience of the world, have been found in the most disparate contexts, revealing the great flexibility of their semantic field and of human imagination and cognition.

This thesis is focused on the linguistic means adopted by the speakers of two Slavic languages, Polish and Russian, and, to a much minor extent, English and few other European languages, but the general theoretical results of this investigation and its cognitive implications should be extended to all human languages and speakers. Besides discovering how these two specific languages behave in certain contexts and which competing forms their speakers can choose from and why, I hope to have given a small contribution to our understanding of how our mind figures out and produces language in general.

7. Appendix

Polish *dla* – Russian simple dative

- 1) *Do tej pory były dla mnie zrozumiałe.* So far, they were **for me** understandable. IUDICANTIS
До сих пор они были мне понятны. So far, they were **to me (DAT)** understandable.

Andrzej Sapkowski. *Boży bojownicy* (1) (2004), Анджей Сапковский. *Божьи войны* (1) (Е. Вайсброт, 2006)

- 2) *Myślisz, że to dla mnie jakaś różnica?* Do you think that it (is) **for me** (of) any difference?
IUDICANTIS
Думаешь, мне не все едино? Do you think that **to me (DAT)** (it is) not all one?

Andrzej Sapkowski. *Boży bojownicy* (1) (2004), Анджей Сапковский. *Божьи войны* (1) (Е. Вайсброт, 2006)

- 3) *Na razie natomiast jasne jest dla mnie jedno [..]* For now however clear is **for me** one [..]
IUDICANTIS
А пока мне ясно одно, [..] For now **to me (DAT)** clear (is) one, [..]

А. Н. Стругацкий, Б. Н. Стругацкий. *Пикник на обочине* (1971), Arkadij Strugacki, Borys Strugacki.
Piknik na Skraju Drogi (Irena Lewandowska, 1974)

- 4) - *Zamów dla mnie koniak, jeżeli już - powiedział.* Order **for me** cognac, if so – he said.
BENEFICIARY
— *Закажите мне лучше коньяку, раз так, — сказал он.* Order **to me (DAT)** better cognac, if so – he said.

А. Н. Стругацкий, Б. Н. Стругацкий. *Пикник на обочине* (1971), Arkadij Strugacki, Borys Strugacki.
Piknik na Skraju Drogi (Irena Lewandowska, 1974)

- 5) *Kiedy znowu położyłem się obok niej, uśmiechnęła się. - A dla mnie? Nagle zrozumiałem.* When again I laid down next to her, she smiled. – And **for me?** I suddenly understood. BENEFICIARY
Когда я снова уселся рядом с ней, она усмехнулась, — А мне? Я вдруг сообразил. When I again sat down near her, she smiled. – And **to me (DAT)?** I suddenly understood.

Stanisław Lem. *Solaris* (1961), Станислав Лем. *Солярис* (Дм. Брускин, 1973)

- 6) *To, [..], jest dla mnie samego trudne do rozwikłania.* This, [..], is **for me** equally hard to solve. IUDICANTIS
В том, [..], мне самому трудно разобратсья. This, [..], **to me (DAT)** (is) equally hard to understand.

Czesław Miłosz. *Zniewolony umysł* (1953), Чеслав Милош. *Порабощенный разум* (В. Л. Британишский, 2003)

- 7) *Niestety, nie kobieta. - Niestety? - Dla pana. - A dla pani? - Dla mnie?* Unfortunately, (it is) not a woman. – Unfortunately? – **For you** (sir). – And **for you** (madam)? – **For me?** IUDICANTIS
Жалко, что не дама. — Кому жалко? — Вам. — А вам? — Мне? Unfortunately, this (is) not a woman. – To whom (DAT) unfortunately? – **To you (DAT)**. – And **to you (DAT)?** – **To me (DAT)?**

Jerzy Andrzejewski. *Popiół i diament* (1948), Ежи Анджеевский. *Пепел и алмаз* (Н. Я. Подольская, 1965)

- 8) *[..] jak niedostępny jest dla mnie świat wyższych uczuć, [..] [..] how unavailable is for me the world of higher emotions [..] IUDICANTIS*
[..] как мне будет недоступен мир особенно возвышенных чувств, [..] [..] how to me (DAT) will be unavailable the world especially of elevated emotions [..]

Гайто Газданов. *Призрак Александра Вольфа* (1947), Gajto Gazdanow. *Widmo Aleksandra Wolfa* (Henryk Chłystowski, 2009)

- 9) *[..] ale było dla mnie oczywiste, że [..] [..] but it was for me obvious that [..] IUDICANTIS*
[..] но мне было ясно, что [..] [..] but to me (DAT) it was clear that [..]

Гайто Газданов. *Призрак Александра Вольфа* (1947), Gajto Gazdanow. *Widmo Aleksandra Wolfa* (Henryk Chłystowski, 2009)

- 10) *Wydawało mi się, że aż do tego dnia własny los nigdy nie był dla mnie tak jasny.* It seemed to me that until that day (my) own fate it had never been **for me** that bright. IUDICANTIS
Мне казалось, что никогда до этого дня моя собственная судьба не была мне так ясна, как теперь. It seemed to me that never until that day for my own fate it had been **to me (DAT)** that bright.

Гайто Газданов. *Призрак Александра Вольфа* (1947), Gajto Gazdanow. *Widmo Aleksandra Wolfa* (Henryk Chłystowski, 2009)

- 11) - *Za niezmiernie ważną informację, dla mnie, [..] wyjaśnił zagraniczny dziwak.* As extremely important information, **for me**, [..] the foreign eccentric explained. IUDICANTIS
 - *Za очень важное сведение, которое мне, [..] пояснил заграничный чудак.* As very important information, that **to me (DAT)**, [..] the foreign eccentric explained.

Михаил Булгаков. *Мастер и Маргарита* (ч. 1) (1929-1940), Michaił Bułhakow. *Mistrz i Małgorzata* (cz 1) (Irena Lewandowska, Witold Dąbrowski, 1969)

- 12) *Bardzo to dla mnie miłe.* It (is) very nice **for me**. IUDICANTIS
Мне это очень приятно. **To me (DAT)** it (is) very nice.

Михаил Булгаков. Мастер и Маргарита (ч. 1) (1929-1940), Michał Bułhakow. Mistrz i Małgorzata (cz 1) (Irena Lewandowska, Witold Dąbrowski, 1969)

- 13) - *Nic dla mnie nie jest trudne - odpowiedział Woland - i ty o tym dobrze wiesz.* Nothing **for me** is difficult – replied Woland – and you know it well. IUDICANTIS
- *Мне ничего не трудно сделать, — ответил Воланд, — и тебе это хорошо известно.* **To me (DAT)** nothing is difficult to do – replied Woland – and you know it well.

Михаил Булгаков. Мастер и Маргарита (ч. 1) (1929-1940), Michał Bułhakow. Mistrz i Małgorzata (cz 1) (Irena Lewandowska, Witold Dąbrowski, 1969)

- 14) *A ten będzie dla mnie - oznajmił Pawka..* And this will be **for me** – announced Pawka.
BENEFICIARY
А это мне - заявил Павка. And this (is) **to me (DAT)** - said Pawka.

Николай Островский. Как закалялась сталь (ч. 1) (1930-1934), Nikolaï Ostrowski. Jak hartowała się stal (cz 1) (Wacław Rogowicz, 1954)

- 15) *Obecnie jest to dla mnie śmieszne, [..].* Now this is **for me** funny, [..] IUDICANTIS
Сейчас мне это смешно, [..]. Now, **to me (DAT)** this (is) funny, [..]

Николай Островский. Как закалялась сталь (ч. 2), Nikolaï Ostrowski. Jak hartowała się stal (cz 2) (Wacław Rogowicz, 1954)

- 16) *Wszystko dla ciebie.* All **for you.** BENEFICIARY
Это все тебе. This all **to you (DAT).**

Andrzej Sapkowski. Lux Perpetua (1) (2006), Анджей Сапковский. Свет вечный (1) (В. Фляк, 2009)

- 17) *Jedno, co mi się udało przechwycić, to jego wiadomość dla ciebie.* The only (thing), that I could intercept, it (was) his message **for you.** BENEFICIARY
Единственное, что мне удалось перехватить, так это его послание тебе. The only (thing), that I could intercept, it (was) his message **to you (DAT).**

Andrzej Sapkowski. Lux Perpetua (2) (2006), Анджей Сапковский. Свет вечный (2) (В. Фляк, 2009)

- 18) *[..] oto prezent dla ciebie. [..],* this is a present **for you.** BENEFICIARY
[..] это презент тебе. [..], this is a present **to you (DAT).**

Andrzej Sapkowski. Narrenturm (1) (2002), Анджей Сапковский. Башня шутов (1) (Е. Вайсброт, 2004)

- 19) *Dla ciebie - przerwał Szarlej - znajdziemy nowe onuce.* **-For you-** interrupted Szarlej – we find new oscypki. BENEFICIARY
Тебе, – прервал Шарлей, – подыщем онучи. -To you (DAT) – interrupted Szarlej, - we'll find oscypki.

Andrzej Sapkowski. Narrenturm (1) (2002), Анджей Сапковский. Башня шутов (1) (Е. Вайсброт, 2004)

20) - *Więc śmierć dla nich. A dla ciebie korona.* Thus death **for them**. And **for you** the crown. BENEFICIARY

Значит, **им** смерть, а **тебе** корона. It means, **to them (DAT)** death, and **to you (DAT)** the crown.

Jacek Dukaj. Ruch generała (1997), Яцек Дукай. Ход генерала (MW, 2004)

21) - *Dla ciebie nie jestem żaden Rudy - mówię.* -**For you** I'm no Rudy-, I say. IUDICANTIS
- *Я тебе не рыжий, - говорю.* - I **to you (DAT)** (am) not red- I say.

А. Н. Стругацкий, Б. Н. Стругацкий. Пикник на обочине (1971), Arkadij Strugacki, Borys Strugacki.
Piknik na Skraju Drogi (Irena Lewandowska, 1974)

22) *Forsa dla ciebie.* Money **for you**. BENEFICIARY
Тебе — деньги. **To you (DAT)** – money.

А. Н. Стругацкий, Б. Н. Стругацкий. Пикник на обочине (1971), Arkadij Strugacki, Borys Strugacki.
Piknik na Skraju Drogi (Irena Lewandowska, 1974)

23) *Lepiej dla ciebie, żebyś teraz ojca nie wspominał, [..]* Better **for you**, if now father doesn't remember, [..] IUDICANTIS
Лучше бы тебе сейчас про отца не вспоминать, [..] Better **to you (DAT)** now about father not remembering, [..]

А. Н. Стругацкий, Б. Н. Стругацкий. Пикник на обочине (1971), Arkadij Strugacki, Borys Strugacki.
Piknik na Skraju Drogi (Irena Lewandowska, 1974)

24) *Święta Mamo! Dla ciebie pająki zabijać to to samo!* Holy mother! **For you** killing spiders it (is) the same! IUDICANTIS
Святая мать! Тебе это — что пауков убивать! Holy mother! **To you (DAT)** this – (is) killing spiders!

Czesław Miłosz. Zniewolony umysł (1953), Чеслав Милош. Порабощенный разум (В. Л. Британишский, 2003)

25) *Czy to dla ciebie nie wszystko jedno?* Is it not **for you** all the same? IUDICANTIS
Не все ли тебе равно? (Is) it not **to you (DAT)** the same?

Гайто Газданов. Призрак Александра Вольфа (1947), Gajto Gazdanow. Widmo Aleksandra Wolfa (Henryk Chłystowski, 2009)

26) - *Tak, oczywiście, ale obawiam się, że grzebanie w książkach i wypisywanie cytatów będzie dla ciebie nudne.* Yes, of course, but I fear that burying (yourself) in the books and writing quotes will be **for you** boring. IUDICANTIS

- *Да, конечно, но я боюсь, что тебе будет скучно рыться в книгах и выписывать цитаты.*
Yes, of course, but I fear that **to you (DAT)** will be boring to dig in the books and write quotes.

Гайто Газданов. Призрак Александра Вольфа (1947), Gajto Gazdanow. Widmo Aleksandra Wolfa (Henryk Chłystowski, 2009)

27) - *Ach, to ja teraz dla ciebie jestem pomoc domowa?* Ah, am I now **for you** a housekeeper?
IUDICANTIS

- *Ах, так я теперь тебе домработница?* Ah, (am) I now **to you (DAT)** a housekeeper?

Михаил Булгаков. Мастер и Маргарита (ч. 2) (1929-1940), Michał Bułhakow. Mistrz i Małgorzata (cz 2) (Irena Lewandowska, Witold Dąbrowski, 1969)

28) *Jaka ja dla ciebie Klaudyna?* How (am) I **for you** Klaudyna? IUDICANTIS
Какая я тебе Клодина? How (am) I **to you (DAT)** Klaudyna?

Михаил Булгаков. Мастер и Маргарита (ч. 2) (1929-1940), Michał Bułhakow. Mistrz i Małgorzata (cz 2) (Irena Lewandowska, Witold Dąbrowski, 1969)

29) *Przywiozłem dla ciebie buty i scyzoryk, mama ci da.* I brought **for you** shoes and pocket knives, mum gives you. BENEFICIARY
Там тебе привез сапоги и ножик, мамка даст. Here **to you (DAT)** I brought shoes and knives, mum gives (you).

Николай Островский. Как закалялась сталь (ч. 1) (1930-1934), Nikolaј Ostrowski. Jak hartowała się stal (cz 1) (Wacław Rogowicz, 1954)

30) *Dla ciebie może są sympatyczni, lecz ja ich nienawidzę* **For you** they may be nice, but I hate them.
IUDICANTIS
Тебе они, может, и приятны, а я их ненавижу. **To you (DAT)** they (are), maybe, nice, but I hate them.

Николай Островский. Как закалялась сталь (ч. 1) (1930-1934), Nikolaј Ostrowski. Jak hartowała się stal (cz 1) (Wacław Rogowicz, 1954)

31) *Czy Armia Czerwona to dla ciebie kino? (Is) Red Army for you cinema?* IUDICANTIS
Что тебе Красная Армия — кино? What (is) to you (DAT) Red Army – cinema?

Николай Островский. Как закалялась сталь (ч. 1) (1930-1934), Nikolaј Ostrowski. Jak hartowała się stal (cz 1) (Wacław Rogowicz, 1954)

32) - *To dla ciebie.* Nie wiesz, od kogo? This (is) **for you**. You don't know, from whom?
BENEFICIARY
- *Это тебе.* Не ведаешь, от кого? This (is) **to you (DAT)**. You don't know, from whom?

Николай Островский. Как закалялась сталь (ч. 2) (1930-1934), Nikolaј Ostrowski. Jak hartowała się stal (cz 2) (Wacław Rogowicz, 1954)

33) *Dlatego przygotowałam dzisiaj dla ciebie dwa zeszyty moich notatek dotyczących przeszłości i niewielki list.* Therefore, I prepared today **for you** two notebooks of my notes about the past and a small letter. BENEFICIARY
Поэтому я сегодня приготовила тебе две тетради моих записей, относящихся к прошлому, и небольшое письмо. Therefore, today I prepared **to you (DAT)** two notebooks of my records about the past and a small letter.

Николай Островский. Как закалялась сталь (ч. 2) (1930-1934), Nikolaј Ostrowski. Jak hartowała się stal (cz 2) (Wacław Rogowicz, 1954)

- 34) - *Wolisz, żeby wszystkie jabłka zostały dla Ciebie?* Do you prefer that all the apples remain **for you**? BENEFICIARY
- *Ты хочешь, чтобы все яблоки тебе остались?* Do you want that all the apples **remain to you (DAT)**?

Гайто Газданов. Вечер у Клэр (1930), Gajto Gazdanow. Wieczór u Claire (Henryk Chłystowski, 2009)

- 35) - *Nie wiem, czy będzie on dla Ciebie zrozumiały.* I don't know, if it will be **for you** understandable. IUDICANTIS
- *Не знаю, будут ли они вам понятны.* I don't know, if it will be **to you (DAT)** clear.

Гайто Газданов. Вечер у Клэр (1930), Gajto Gazdanow. Wieczór u Claire (Henryk Chłystowski, 2009)

- 36) *[..] i już wtedy próbował znaleźć dla niej wytłumaczenie.* [...] and even then he tried to find **for her** an explanation. BENEFICIARY
[..] и уже тогда он пробовал найти ей объяснение. [...] and even then he tried to find **to her (DAT)** an explanation.

Olga Tokarczuk. *Podróż ludzi księgi* (1993) Ольга Токарчук. *Путь Людей Книги* (К. Я. Старосельская, 2002)

- 37) *To, [..], stopniowo stawało się dla niej rzeczą naturalną.* This, [...] gradually became **for her** a natural thing. IUDICANTIS
То, [..], стало постепенно казаться ей естественным. This, [...] began gradually to seem **to her (DAT)** natural.

Гайто Газданов. Призрак Александра Вольфа (1947), Gajto Gazdanow. *Widmo Aleksandra Wolfa* (Henryk Chłystowski, 2009)

- 38) *Na domiar złego było dla niej zupełnie oczywiste, że nie ma dokąd iść.* To make matters worse, it was **for her** quite obvious that there was nowhere to go. IUDICANTIS
А между тем ей совершенно ясно было, что идти ей отсюда больше некуда. As a matter of fact, **to her (DAT)** it was completely clear that she had nowhere to go.

Михаил Булгаков. *Мастер и Маргарита* (ч. 2) (1929-1940), Michał Bułhakow. *Mistrz i Małgorzata* (cz 2) (Irena Lewandowska, Witold Dąbrowski, 1969)

- 39) *[..] nie podzielała, to było dla niej nieciekawe.* She didn't enjoy, it was **for her** dull. IUDICANTIS
[..] недолюбливала, это было ей менее интересно, нежели остальное. She didn't like, it was **to her (DAT)** less interesting than the rest.

Гайто Газданов. Вечер у Клэр (1930), Gajto Gazdanow. Wieczór u Claire (Henryk Chłystowski, 2009)

- 40) *Nawet dzisiejszy wieczór z Atanazym był tylko opowiedzianym jej przeżyciem jakiejś znajomej, sympatycznej dla niej dziewczynki.* Even this evening with Atanasius it was only told to her the story of some familiar, nice **for her** little girl. IUDICANTIS

Далее сегодняшней вечер с Атаназием казался ей всего лишь рассказом какой-то знакомой, симпатичной **ей** девушки. Even this evening with Anastasius it seemed to her only the story of some familiar, nice **to her (DAT)** little girl.

Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz. Pożegnanie jesieni (1925), Станислав Игнацы Виткевич. Прощание с осенью (Ю. Чайников, 2006)

41) *Rzuciła się ku niemu całym ciałem, szepcząc coś dla niej samej niezrozumiałego.* She threw herself towards him with the whole body, whispering something even **for her** incomprehensible.

IUDICANTIS

Она бросилась к нему всем телом, шепча что-то, ей самой непонятное. She threw herself towards him with the whole body, whispering something even **to her (DAT)** incomprehensible.

Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz. Pożegnanie jesieni (1925), Станислав Игнацы Виткевич. Прощание с осенью (Ю. Чайников, 2006)

42) *[..], Praga dla niego niedobra.* [..], Praga **for him** (was) no good. IUDICANTIS

[..], Прага ему не к добру. [..], Praga **to him (DAT)** (was) no good.

Andrzej Sapkowski. Lux Perpetua (1) (2006), Анджей Сапковский. Свет вечный (1) (В. Фляк, 2009)

43) *[..], lecz Najwyższe Arkana rodowitych Longaevi wciąż były dlań niedostępne, [..]* [..] but the Highest Arkans born Longaevi still were **for him** unavailable [..] IUDICANTIS

[..], но Высшие Тайны истинных Longaevi оставались ему недоступны, [..] [..] but the Highest Arkans born Longaevi remained **to him (DAT)** unavailable [..]

Andrzej Sapkowski. Lux Perpetua (1) (2006), Анджей Сапковский. Свет вечный (1) (В. Фляк, 2009)

44) *Było to dla niego jasne, [..]* It was **for him** clear, [..] IUDICANTIS

Ему это было ясно, [..] It (was) **to him (DAT)** clear, [..]

Andrzej Sapkowski. Narrenturm (2) (2002), Анджей Сапковский. Башня шутов (2) (Е. Вайсброт, 2004)

45) *[..] że liczy się dlań wyłącznie jego własna wygoda, [..]* [..] that it matters **for him** only his own comfort [..] IUDICANTIS

[..] что ему важны лишь собственное удобство, [..] [..] that **to him (DAT)** it matters his own comfort [..]

Andrzej Sapkowski. Narrenturm (2) (2002), Анджей Сапковский. Башня шутов (2) (Е. Вайсброт, 2004)

46) *Zręcznie wylapaliście posłów, którzy wzięli dlań koronę [..]* Cleverly you captured the members, who took **for him** the crown [..] BENEFICIARY

Ловко схватили послов, которые везли ему корону [..] Cleverly you captured the members, who took **to him (DAT)** the crown [..]

Andrzej Sapkowski. Lux Perpetua (2) (2006), Анджей Сапковский. Свет вечный (2) (В. Фляк, 2009)

47) § 1. *Kto bez uprawnienia uzyskuje informację dla niego nie przeznaczoną, [..]* § 1. Who without autorisation obtained information **for him** not intended [..] BENEFICIARY

§ 1. *Лицо, без правомочия получающее не предназначенную ему информацию, [...]* § 1. The person, without autorisation obtaining not designed **to him (DAT)** information, [...]

Kodeks karny RP (1997), Уголовный кодекс Республики Польша (2000-2010)

48) *I wtedy wszystko stanie się dla niego jasne, [...]* And so everything becomes **for him** clear, [...]

IUDICANTIS

И вот тогда станет ему все понятно, [...] And so (it) becomes **to him (DAT)** everything clear, [...]

A. H. Стругацкий, Б. Н. Стругацкий. Пикник на обочине (1971), Arkadij Strugacki, Borys Strugacki. Piknik na Skraju Drogi (Irena Lewandowska, 1974)

49) *Przyczyny zdumiewającej pustki w pracowni były dla niego niepojęte aż do przyjścia pani Glebowej, [...]* The reasons of surprising emptiness in the studio were **for him** incomprehensible until the arrival of mister Glebowi [...]

IUDICANTIS

Причина удивительной пустоты в мастерской была ему совершенно непонятна вплоть до прихода пани Глебовой, [...] The reason of surprising emptiness in the studio was **to him (DAT)** completely incomprehensible until the arrival of mister Glebowi [...]

Joanna Chmielewska. Wszyscy jesteśmy podejrzani (1966), Иоанна Хмелевская. Мы все под подозрением (Вера Селиванова, 1993)

50) *[...] każdy mieszka we właściwej dla niego dzielnicy. [...]* everyone lives in the right **for him** district.

BENEFICIARY

[...] живет ли он в положенном ему районе. [...] lives if he in the right **to him (DAT)** district.

Czesław Miłosz. Zniewolony umysł (1953), Чеслав Милош. Порабощенный разум (В. Л. Британишский, 2003)

51) *[...], był dla niego samego trudny do zdefiniowania; [...]* [...] it was **for himself** hard to define [...]

IUDICANTIS

[...], ему самому было трудно проанализировать; [...] [...] **to himself (DAT)** it was hard to analyse [...]

Czesław Miłosz. Zniewolony umysł (1953), Чеслав Милош. Порабощенный разум (В. Л. Британишский, 2003)

52) *Zrozumiał, że prostokąt światła u wylotu sieni jest dla niego nieosiągalny.* He understood that the rectangle of light in front of the hallway is **for him** unattainable. IUDICANTIS

Он понял, что прямоугольник дневного света в конце ворот ему недоступен. He understood that the rectangle of the day light at the end of the door (is) **to him (DAT)** inaccessible.

Bohdan Czeszko. Pokolenie (1951), Богдан Чешко. Поколение (С. Свяцкий, 1965)

53) - *Przecież dla niego to jest zupełnie obojętne, [...]* After all **for him** this is completely indifferent, [...]

IUDICANTIS

- *Ведь ему безразлично, [...]* After all **to him (DAT)** indifferent, [...]

Михаил Булгаков. Мастер и Маргарита (ч. 1) (1929-1940) , Michał Bułhakow. Mistrz i Małgorzata (cz 1) (Irena Lewandowska, Witold Dąbrowski, 1969)

54) [...] *bileciki są mu potrzebne w liczbie dwóch, dla niego samego mianowicie i dla Pelagii Antonowny, jego żony.* [...] tickets are to him necessary in two, **for himself** namely and for Pelagii Antonowny, his wife. IUDICANTIS

[...] *контрамарок ему нужна только парочка, ему и Пелагее Антоновне, его супруге,* [...] [...] passes to him (are) necessary only in couple, **to him (DAT)** and to Pelagii Antonowne, his wife [...]

Михаил Булгаков. Мастер и Маргарита (ч. 1) (1929-1940) , Michał Bułhakow. Mistrz i Małgorzata (cz 1) (Irena Lewandowska, Witold Dąbrowski, 1969)

55) "[...] *śmierć dla niego i dla mnie*" [...] "[...] death **for him** and **for me**" [...] BENEFICIARY (MALEFICIARY)

"[...] *и ему и мне могила*" [...] "[...] and **to him (DAT)** and **to me (DAT)** death"[...]

Николай Островский. Как закалялась сталь (ч. 2) (1930-1934), Nikolaï Ostrowski. Jak hartowała się stal (cz 2) (Wacław Rogowicz, 1954)

56) [...] *i Ledieniew z aprobatą kiwnął głową w odpowiedzi na to tylko dla niego zrozumiałe zdanie.* [...] and Ledieniew approvingly nodded as an answer to a sentence only **for him** understandable.

IUDICANTIS

[...] *и Леденев одобрительно кивнул головой в ответ на эту одному ему понятную фразу.* [...] and Ledenev approvingly nodded as an answer to a sentence only **to him (DAT)** understandable.

Николай Островский. Как закалялась сталь (ч. 2) (1930-1934), Nikolaï Ostrowski. Jak hartowała się stal (cz 2) (Wacław Rogowicz, 1954)

57) [...] *nie jest dla niego konieczne leżenie w klinice.* [...] it is not **for him** necessary to lie down in the clinic. IUDICANTIS

[...] *в клинику ему ложиться не обязательно.* [...] in the clinic **to him (DAT)** to lie down (is) not necessary.

Николай Островский. Как закалялась сталь (ч. 2) (1930-1934), Nikolaï Ostrowski. Jak hartowała się stal (cz 2) (Wacław Rogowicz, 1954)

58) - *Tajusza nie jest dla niego, - powiedziała któregoś dnia do Loli.* Tajusza is not **for him**, - (she) said some day to Lola. BENEFICIARY

- *Таюша ему не пара, - сказала она как-то Леле.* Tajusha **to him (DAT)** (is) not couple, - (she) said somehow to Lola.

Николай Островский. Как закалялась сталь (ч. 2) (1930-1934), Nikolaï Ostrowski. Jak hartowała się stal (cz 2) (Wacław Rogowicz, 1954)

59) [...] *które stworzyliśmy dla niego wiele setek lat po jego śmierci.* [...] that we created **for him** many hundreds of years after his death [...] BENEFICIARY

[...] *которую мы создали ему много сот лет после его смерти.* [...] that we created **to him (DAT)** many hundreds of years after his death [...]

Гайто Газданов. Вечер у Клэр (1930), Gajto Gazdanow. Wieczór u Claire (Henryk Chłystowski, 2009)

60) *Niewidzialne dla nas.* Invisible **for us.** IUDICANTIS

Невидимые нам. Invisible to us (DAT).

Andrzej Sapkowski. Narrenturm (2) (2002), Анджей Сапковский. Башня шутов (2) (Е. Вайсброт, 2004)

- 61) *Plany NSDAP w stosunku do naszego narodu były dla nas jasne* [...] The plans of NSDAP regarding our people were **for us** clear [...] IUDICANTIS
Планы нацистов в отношении нашего народа были нам ясны [...] The plans of the Nazis regarding our people were **to us (DAT)** clear [...]

Czesław Miłosz. Zniewolony umysł (1953), Чеслав Милош. Порабощенный разум (В. Л. Британишский, 2003)

- 62) *Pół dnia będę tam pracował i wtedy dla nas dwojga wystarczy, a ty już nie chodź do pracy* [...] Half a day I will work there and so **for us** two it is enough, [...] IUDICANTIS
Полдня буду там работать, и этого нам хватит с тобой, [...] Half a day I will work there and so **to us (DAT)** it is enough with you, [...]

Николай Островский. Как закалялась сталь (ч. 1), Nikolaï Ostrowski. Jak hartowała się stal (cz 1) (Wacław Rogowicz, 1954)

- 63) *Teraz wyszło dla nas prawo, byśmy żyli jak należy.* Now it came out **for us** the right us to live properly. BENEFICIARY
А теперь нам право вышло жить на свете как полагается. And now **to us (DAT)** the right came out to live in this world properly.

Николай Островский. Как закалялась сталь (ч. 1), Nikolaï Ostrowski. Jak hartowała się stal (cz 1) (Wacław Rogowicz, 1954)

- 64) *Starzec słuchał relacji, rozparty na krześle w zwykłej dla siebie, niewiarygodnie koślawej pozie.* The old man listened to the report, spread on the chair in the usual **for him** incredibly crooked position. IUDICANTIS
Старик слушал сообщение, устроившись на стуле в присущей ему невероятно перекошенной позе. The old man listened to the report, sitting on the chair in the usual **to him (DAT)** incredibly skewed position.

Andrzej Sapkowski. Narrenturm (1) (2002), Анджей Сапковский. Башня шутов (1) (Е. Вайсброт, 2004)

- 65) *Może miałeś, ale już nie masz. Czy to dla cię jasne?* Maybe you had, but now you no longer have. Is it **for you** clear? IUDICANTIS
Может, и было что, но теперь нечего. Тебе это ясно? Maybe, it was, but now (it is) nothing. **To you (DAT)** is it clear?

Andrzej Sapkowski. Narrenturm (2) (2002), Анджей Сапковский. Башня шутов (2) (Е. Вайсброт, 2004)

- 66) *Najważniejsze dla Markiza było uchwycenie momentu,* [...] The most important **for Marzika** was to capture the moment, [...] IUDICANTIS
Важнее всего Маркизу было ухватить момент, [...] More important thing **to Marzika (DAT)** was to catch the moment, [...]

Olga Tokarczuk. *Podróż ludzi księgi* (1993), Ольга Токарчук. *Путь Людей Книги* (К. Я. Старосельская, 2002)

IUDICANTIS: 45 CASES

BENEFICIARY: 21 CASES

Russian *dlja* – Polish simple dative

- 67) *[..], потому что без Ютты этот мир для меня ничего не значит. [..], because without Jutty this world for me doesn't mean anything [..] IUDICANTIS*
[..], bo bez Jutty nic mi po tym świecie. [..] because without Jutty nothing to me (DAT) of this world.

Andrzej Sapkowski. *Lux Perpetua* (2) (2006), Анжей Сапковский. *Свет вечный* (2) (В. Фляк, 2009)

- 68) - *А я не люблю, когда для меня устраивают, - сказал Рэдрик. - And I don't like, when for me they arrange -, said Redrik. BENEFICIARY*
- A ja nie lubię, jak mi załatwiają - powiedział Red. - And I don't like, how to me (DAT) they arrange- said Red.

А. Н. Стругацкий, Б. Н. Стругацкий. *Пикник на обочине* (1971), Arkadij Strugacki, Borys Strugacki. *Piknik na Skraju Drogi* (Irena Lewandowska, 1974)

- 69) *[..], что причины этой веселости достаточно ясны для меня, [..]. [..], that the reasons of this gaiety (are) enough clear for me, [..] IUDICANTIS*
[..], czy przyczyny tej wesołości są mi dostatecznie jasne, [..]. [..] that the reasons of this gaiety are to me (DAT) enough clear, [..]

Stanisław Lem. *Solaris* (1961), Станислав Лем. *Солярис* (Дм. Брускин, 1973)

- 70) *[..], но для меня самого это прозвучало неубедительно. [..], but (even) for me this sounded unconvincing. IUDICANTIS*
[..], ale samemu zabrzmiało mi to nieprzekonująco. [..], but even sounded to me (DAT) unconvincing.

Stanisław Lem. *Solaris* (1961), Станислав Лем. *Солярис* (Дм. Брускин, 1973)

- 71) *Для нее же верность ассоциировалась с потерей. For her loyalty was associated with loss. IUDICANTIS*
A wierność kojarzyła jej się zawsze ze stratą. And loyalty was associated to her (DAT) always with loss.

Olga Tokarczuk. *Podróż ludzi księgi* (1993), Ольга Токарчук. *Путь Людей Книги* (К. Я. Старосельская, 2002)

- 72) *Скорее он был для нее отцом и ребенком одновременно. Rather he was for her the father and the child at the same time. IUDICANTIS*

Był raczej jej ojcem i dzieckiem jednocześnie. He was **to her (DAT)** father and child at the same time.

Olga Tokarczuk. *Podróż ludzi księgi* (1993), Ольга Токарчук. *Путь Людей Книги* (К. Я. Старосельская, 2002)

73) *Патриотизм был для нее как шедевр подлинного искусства, [...].* Patriotism was **for her** like the masterpiece of genuine art, [...] IUDICANTIS
Patriotyzm jej był tak żarliwy, [...] jak dzieło wielkiej sztuki. Patriotism **to her (DAT)** was so passionate, [...] like a masterpiece of great art.

Bohdan Czeszko. *Pokolenie* (1951), Богдан Чешко. *Поколение* (С. Свяцкий, 1965)

74) *Так будет лучше и для нее и для нас. - Для нас, но не для нее.* So it will be better **for her and for us. -For us, but not for her.** IUDICANTIS
I jej będzie lepiej, i nam. - Nam może, ale nie jej. And **to her (DAT)** it will be better, and **to us (DAT).** – **To us (DAT)** maybe, but not **to her (DAT).**

Jerzy Andrzejewski. *Popiół i diament* (1948), Ежи Анджеевский. *Пепел и алмаз* (Н. Я. Подольская, 1965)

75) *Свершилось то, что жизнь начертала для него невидимыми чернилами в главе под названием «Любовь».* It occurred, that life inscribed **for him** with invisible ink in the chapter under title “Love”. BENEFICIARY
Spełniło się to, co życie zapisało mu sekretnym atramentem w rozdziale pod tytułem "Miłość". It happened that life inscribed **to him (DAT)** with secret ink in the chapter under the title “Love”.

Olga Tokarczuk. *Podróż ludzi księgi* (1993), Ольга Токарчук. *Путь Людей Книги* (К. Я. Старосельская, 2002)

76) *Кто захочет перегонять для него собственную кровь?* Who wants to distill **for him** his own blood? BENEFICIARY
Kto zechce mu destylować swoją własną krew? Who wants **to him (DAT)** distill his own blood?

Olga Tokarczuk. *Podróż ludzi księgi* (1993), Ольга Токарчук. *Путь Людей Книги* (К. Я. Старосельская, 2002)

77) *Джонсон понял это с характерной для него быстротой соображения, [...]* Johnson grasped this with characteristic **for him** speed of understanding, [...] IUDICANTIS
Johnson zrozumiał to z właściwą mu bystrością [...] Johnson understood this with proper **to him (DAT)** acumen [...]

Гайто Газданов. *Призрак Александра Вольфа* (1947), Gajto Gazdanow. *Widmo Aleksandra Wolfa* (Henryk Chłystowski, 2009)

78) *Что ж, бегство и скитание – это для нас не ново...* Well, escape and wandering – these (are) **for us** not new... IUDICANTIS
Cóż, ucieczka i tułaczka rzecz mi nie nowa... Well, escape and wandering (are) thing **to me (DAT)** not new...

Andrzej Sapkowski. Lux Perpetua (2) (2006), Анджей Сапковский. Свет вечный (2) (В. Фляк, 2009)

- 79) - *Так будет лучше и для нее и для нас.* - *Для нас, но не для нее.* So it will be better **for her** and **for us**. -For us, but not for her. IUDICANTIS
- *I jej będzie lepiej, i nam.* - *Nam może, ale nie jej.* . And **to her (DAT)** it will be better, and **to us (DAT)**. – To us maybe, but not to her.

Jerzy Andrzejewski. Popiół i diament (1948), Ежи Анджеевский. Пепел и алмаз (Н. Я. Подольская, 1965)

- 80) *[..], symbolami которого станут для нас другие люди [..] [..] symbols whose will be for us other people [..] IUDICANTIS*
[..], którego symbolami będą nam inni ludzie [..] [..] whose symbols will be to us (DAT) other people [..]

Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz. Pożegnanie jesieni (1925), Станислав Игнацы Виткевич. Прощание с осенью (Ю. Чайников, 2006)

IUDICANTIS: 11 CASES

BENEFICIARY: 3 CASES

Polish *dla* – other Russian prepositions

- 81) - *Przyjechałeś na Śląsk wyłącznie dla mnie?* – [..] -Did you come to Śląsk only **for me?**
BENEFICIARY
- *Ты приехал в Силезию исключительно ради меня?* - [..] Did you come to Silezni exclusively **for me?**

Andrzej Sapkowski. Boży wojownicy (1) (2004), Анджей Сапковский. Божьи воины (1) (Е. Вайсброт, 2006)

- 82) - *Dla mnie* – [..] - *mogą sobie husyci przyjmować choćby nawet pod postacią klistiery, od dupy strony!* – **For me**- [..] must the Hussites accept even in the guise of clysters, from the ass!
IUDICANTIS
- *По мне*, – [..], – *так пусть гуситы принимают комунию хоть в виде клистира, со стороны задницы!* **For me** – [..] – so let the Hussites accept someone just in the form of clysters from the ass!

Andrzej Sapkowski. Narrenturm (2) (2002), Анджей Сапковский. Башня шутов (2) (Е. Вайсброт, 2004)

- 83) *Miejcie dla mnie cierpliwość!* Have for me patience! BENEFICIARY
Будьте терпеливы со мной! Be patient with me!

Владимир Набоков. Лолита (1967), Vladimir Nabokov. Lolita (Michał Kłobukowski, 1997)

- 84) *Dzisiaj niezwykły dla mnie dzień.* Today (it's an) unusual **for me** day. IUDICANTIS

Сегодня у **меня** замечательный день. Today **by/at me** (is a) remarkable day.

Николай Островский. Как закалялась сталь (ч. 1) (1930-1934), Nikolaј Ostrowski. Jak hartowała się stal (cz 1) (Wacław Rogowicz, 1954)

85) *Zapomniałeś chyba, Neplach, że pracowałem dla Ciebie.* You forgot maybe, Neplach, that I worked **for you**. BENEFICIARY
Ты небось забыл, Неплах, что я работал на тебя. You probably forgot, Neplach, that I worked **towards you**.

Andrzej Sapkowski. Boży bojownicy (1) (2004), Анджей Сапковский. Божьи воины (1) (Е. Вайсброт, 2006)

86) - *Przypominam - wtrącił Samson - że zrobiliśmy to dla Ciebie.* -I recall- intervened Samson – that we did it **for you**. BENEFICIARY
– *Напоминаю, - вставил Самсон, - что мы делали это ради тебя.* I recall- intervened Samson – that we did that **for you**.

Andrzej Sapkowski. Narrenturm (2) (2002), Анджей Сапковский. Башня шутов (2) (Е. Вайсброт, 2004)

87) *[..]chętnie uległem i specjalnie dla Ciebie przedzierzgnąłem się w opalonego cesarusa, [..] [..]* willingly I suffered and especially **for you** I turned into a tanned caesarian, [..] BENEFICIARY
[..]я охотно подчинился и превратился ради тебя в представителя бронзовой молодежи, [..]
*[..] I eagerly obeyed and turned **for you** into a representative of bronze youth [..]*

Владимир Набоков. Лолита (1967), Vladimir Nabokov. Lolita (Michał Kłobukowski, 1997)

88) *Nie mam powodu być dla Ciebie uprzejma.* I don't have any reason to be **for you** polite.
BENEFICIARY
У меня нет никаких причин быть с тобой любезной. I don't have any reason to be **by/at you** polite.

Joanna Chmielewska. Wszyscy jesteśmy podejrzani (1966) , Иоанна Хмелевская. Мы все под подозрением (Вера Селиванова, 1993)

89) *[..], a on sam stawał się dla niej zakutym w srebrną zbroję rycerzem.* [..] and himself became **for her** a knight handcuffed with silver armor. BENEFICIARY
[..], a on mnił себя готовым ради нее на все рыцарем, закованным в серебряные доспехи [..]
and he claimed himself ready **for her** to all knight, imprisoned in a silver armor.

Olga Tokarczuk. Podróż ludzi księgi (1993), Ольга Токарчук. Путь Людей Книги (К. Я. Старосельская, 2002)

90) *[..] i jak Barbridge prosił o litość, nawet nie dla siebie, a dla dzieci, dla niej i dla Arenie[..] [..]* and as Barbridge asked for mercy, not even **for himself, but for the children, for her and for Arenie** [..] BENEFICIARY
[..] и как Барбридж просил — не за себя просил даже, за детей, за нее и за Арчи, [..] [..] and as Babridge begged – not even **over himself, over the children, over her and over Archi**, [..]

A. H. Стругацкий, Б. Н. Стругацкий. Пикник на обочине (1971), Arkadij Strugacki, Borys Strugacki.
Piknik na Skraju Drogi (Irena Lewandowska, 1974)

- 91) *I że to nie jest lekka rzecz... I że trzeba dla niej wiele poświęcić...* And that it's not a light thing... and that it's necessary **for her** to sacrifice a lot... BENEFICIARY
Время это нелегкое, многим приходится жертвовать ради общего блага... The time this (is) difficult, a lot has to sacrifice **for common good**...

Zofia Kossak. Król trędowaty (1937), Зофья Коссака. Король-крестоносец (Н. Смирнова, С. Скорвид, 1995)

- 92) *[..] a nawet czując dla niej pewnego rodzaju nienawiść.* [...] and even feeling **for her** a certain kind of hatred. BENEFICIARY (MALEFICIARY)
[..] и даже испытывает к ней своеобразную ненависть. [...] and even felt **towards her** a kind of hatred.

Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz. Pożegnanie jesieni (1925), Станислав Игнацы Виткевич. Прощание с осенью (Ю. Чайников, 2006)

- 93) - *Dla niego - Ofka zacisnęła zęby - gotowa jestem na wszystko.* -**For him**- Ofka gritted the teeth- I am ready to everything. - BENEFICIARY
- *Ради него, - Ofka стиснула зубы, - я готова на всё.* -**For him**, - Ofka gritted the teeth, - I am read to everything. -

Andrzej Sapkowski. Lux Perpetua (2) (2006) , Анджей Сапковский. Свет вечный (2) (В. Фляк, 2009)

- 94) *Sytuacja, [...], nie była dla niego najzręczniejsza.* The situation, [...] was not **for him** the darkest. IUDICANTIS
Положение, [...], было у него сейчас не из лучших. The situation, [...], was **at/by him** now not the best.

Andrzej Sapkowski. Narrenturm (1) (2002), Анджей Сапковский. Башня шутов (1) (Е. Вайсброт, 2004)

- 95) § 1. *Kto zabija człowieka na jego żądanie i pod wpływem współczucia dla niego, [...]* Who kills a person at his request and under the influence of pity **for him**, [...] BENEFICIARY
§ 1. *Лицо, убившее человека по его требованию и под влиянием сочувствия к нему, [...]* Someone, who killed a person at his request and under the influence of pity **towards him** [...]

Kodeks karny RP (1997), Уголовный кодекс Республики Польша (2000-2010)

- 96) *Dzięki temu pojawiła się dla niego szansa słuchania samego siebie [...]* As a result appeared **for him** the chance of listening to himself [...] IUDICANTIS
Отчего у него появилась возможность слушать самого себя [...] Why **at/by him** appeared the possibility to listen to himself [...]

Olga Tokarczuk. Podróż ludzi księgi (1993) , Ольга Токарчук. Путь Людей Книги (К. Я. Старосельская, 2002)

97) *[..] i dla niego ryzykowali zdrowie i życie. [..]* and **for him** they risked health and life [..]
BENEFICIARY

[..], radi niego ryzykowali zdrowiem i życiem. [..] **for him** they risked health and life [..]

Olga Tokarczuk. *Podróż ludzi księgi* (1993), Ольга Токарчук. *Путь Людей Книги* (К. Я. Старосельская, 2002)

98) *Maszyny już pracują dla niego, a kredyt...* The machines already work **for him**, and the credit..
BENEFICIARY

Машины уже работают на него, а кредит... The machines already work **towards him**, and the credit..

Bohdan Czeszko. *Pokolenie* (1951), Богдан Чешко. *Покolenie* (С. Свяцкий, 1965)

99) *Wierzyli, nie wierzyli - wojowali dla niego, [..]* They believed, they didn't believe- they fought **for him** [..] BENEFICIARY

Верили не верили, а воевали за него, [..] They believed, they didn't believe- they fought **over/behind him** [..]

Bohdan Czeszko. *Pokolenie* (1951), Богдан Чешко. *Покolenie* (С. Свяцкий, 1965)

100) *Poświęcił dla niego obrażoną i do żywego dotkniętą rodzinę.* He gave up **for him** the insulted and troubled for life family. BENEFICIARY

Radi niego on otrepsał się od oszczerzonej, rozgniewanej rodziny. **For him** he disowned the insulted, angry family.

Jerzy Andrzejewski. *Popiół i diament* (1948), Ежи Анджеевский. *Пепел и алмаз* (Н. Я. Подольская, 1965)

101) *Nie było dla niego żadnych kwestii wątpliwych.* It wasn't **for him** any questionable matter.
IUDICANTIS

У него не было ничего нерешенного. **At/by him** it wasn't nothing unresolved.

Николай Островский. *Как закалялась сталь* (ч. 1) (1930-1934), Nikołaј Ostrowski. *Jak hartowała się stal* (cz 1) (Wacław Rogowicz, 1954)

102) *A wszystko to, jeśli dobrze zrozumiałem, tylko dla nas dwu.* And all this, if I understood well, only **for us** two. BENEFICIARY

I все это, если я верно понял, только ради нас двоих. And all this, if I understood correctly, only **for us** two.

Andrzej Sapkowski. *Narrenturm* (2) (2002), Анджей Сапковский. *Башня шутов* (2) (Е. Вайсброт, 2004)

103) *Dla nas pracują te wszystkie umiarkowane reformatory.* **For us** work all these moderate reformers. BENEFICIARY

На нас работают все эти умеренные реформаторы. **Towards us** work all these moderate reformers.

Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz. *Pożegnanie jesieni* (1925), Станислав Игнацы Виткевич. *Прощание с осенью* (Ю. Чайников, 2006)

- 104) [...] *oczywiście mimo woli dla nas - miałem wiadomości tajne.* [...] of course involuntarily **for us** – I had secret messages. BENEFICIARY
[...] *конечно, сам того не желая, но ради нас, есть у меня секретная информация.* [...] of course, unwittingly, but **for us**, I had secret information.

Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz. Pożegnanie jesieni (1925), Станислав Игнацы Виткевич. Прощание с осенью (Ю. Чайников, 2006)

- 105) **Dla dobra kraju** wyrzeknijcie się wroźdy i oddajcie go. **For the good of the country**, you give up the hostility and hand him over. PURPOSE/ BENEFICIARY
Ради блага страны откажитесь от вражды и отдайте его. **For the sake of the country**, you give up the hostility and hand him over.

Andrzej Sapkowski. Boży bojownicy (2) (2004), Анджей Сапковский. Божьи войны (2) (Е. Вайсброт, 2006)

- 106) **Dla towarzystwa** popłakala się matka Barbary i Enedy, [...] **For company** cried the mother of Barbara and Eneda, [...] PURPOSE
За компанию заплакала мать Барбары и Энеды, [...] **Over company** cried the mother of Barbara and Eneda, [...]

Andrzej Sapkowski. Boży bojownicy (2) (2004), Анджей Сапковский. Божьи войны (2) (Е. Вайсброт, 2006)

- 107) [...], *ale obawiam się, że wielu pracuje na dwie strony, znaczy, dla Hejnczego też...* [...], but I'm afraid that many work on two sides, that is, **for Hejncz** also... BENEFICIARY
[...], *но боюсь, многие работают на две стороны, то есть на Гејнче тоже.* [...], but I'm afraid that many work on two sides, that is, **towards Gejncz** also...

Andrzej Sapkowski. Boży bojownicy (2) (2004), Анджей Сапковский. Божьи войны (2) (Е. Вайсброт, 2006)

- 108) *I to, co mi osobiście zrobić rozkazywałeś.* **Dla sprawy.** And this, that to me personally you ordered to do. **For the cause.** PURPOSE
И то, что ты лично приказывал мне делать. **Ради дела.** And this, that you personally ordered to me to do. **For the cause.**

Andrzej Sapkowski. Boży bojownicy (2) (2004), Анджей Сапковский. Божьи войны (2) (Е. Вайсброт, 2006)

- 109) *I wtedy, kiedyśmy dla oszczędności brali we dwu jedną kurwę w bordelu na Celetnej, na Starym Mieście.* And then when we **for economy** took in two one whore in a brothel in Celetna, in Old Town. PURPOSE
Да еще когда мы экономии ради брали одну курву на двоих в борделе на Целетней в Старом Городе. And then when we **for economy** took one whore in two in a brothel in Celetna, in Old Town.

Andrzej Sapkowski. Narrenturm (2) (2002), Анджей Сапковский. Башня шутов (2) (Е. Вайсброт, 2004)

- 110) *Jego dziadek za zasługi dla króla Francji otrzymał tytuł szlachecki.* His grandfather for services **for the king** of France received a noble title. BENEFICIARY
Ego ded za zasługi przed królem получил дворянство. His grandfather for services **in front of the king** received knighthood.

Olga Tokarczuk. Podróż ludzi księgi (1993), Ольга Токарчук. Путь Людей Книги (К. Я. Старосельская, 2002)

PURPOSE: 3 CASES

BENEFICIARY: 21 CASES

PURPOSE/ BENEFICIARY: 1 CASE

IUDICANTIS: 5 CASES

Ради = 13 cases; По = 1 case; со = 2 cases; у = 4 cases; перед = 1 case; на = 4 cases; за = 3 cases; к = 2 cases

Russian *dla* - other Polish prepositions

- 111) *A teraz — иди. Разве что у тебя есть что-нибудь для меня.* And now – go. Unless you have something **for me**. BENEFICIARY
A teraz idź już. Chyba że masz coś do mnie. And now go. Unless you have something **towards me**.

Andrzej Sapkowski. Boży bojownicy (2) (2004), Анджей Сапковский. Божьи воины (2) (Е. Вайсброт, 2006)

- 112) *[..] и он не мог войти незаметно для меня. [..]* and he could not enter quietly **for me**. BENEFICIARY
[..] a nie mógł wejść nie zauważony przez mnie. [..] and he could not enter not noticed **through/for me**.

Stanisław Lem. Solaris (1961), Станислав Лем. Солярис (Дм. Брускин, 1973)

- 113) *W kabine było pismo dla mnie.* In the cabin (there) was a letter **for me**. BENEFICIARY
W kabinie był list do mnie. In the cabin (there) was a letter **towards me**.

Stanisław Lem. Solaris (1961), Станислав Лем. Солярис (Дм. Брускин, 1973)

- 114) *[..] это чуточку высоковато для тебя. [..]* this (is) a little high **for you**. IUDICANTIS
[..] to trochę za wysoko jak na ciebie. [..] this (is) a bit high like **towards you**.

Andrzej Sapkowski. Boży bojownicy (2) (2004), Анджей Сапковский. Божьи воины (2) (Е. Вайсброт, 2006)

- 115) [...] *которая коротала свой вдовий век в непомерно большом для нее помещении.* [...] who whiled away for widow's age in an unreasonably big **for her space**. IUDICANTIS
[...], *która wdowim prawem dogorywała w izbie zbyt obszernej na jej nieruchawość.* [...] who the widow law spent in the house too large **towards her property**.

Bohdan Czeszko. Pokolenie (1951), Богдан Чешко. Поколение (С. Свяцкий, 1965)

- 116) [...] *сказал он с необычной для него теплотой.* [...] he said with unusual **for him** warmth. IUDICANTIS
[...], *powiedział z rzadkim u niego akcentem serdeczności.* [...] he said with rare **at/by him** accent of warmth.

Jerzy Andrzejewski. Popiół i diament (1948), Ежи Анджеевский. Пепел и алмаз (Н. Я. Подольская, 1965)

- 117) [...] *который был для него нехарактерен.* [...] that was **for him** not typical. IUDICANTIS
[...], *co było u niego niespotykane.* [...] what was **at/by him** unusual.

Гайто Газданов. Призрак Александра Вольфа (1947), Gajto Gazdanow. Widmo Aleksandra Wolfa (Henryk Chłystowski, 2009)

- 118) [...] *имеющих право на жизнь почти для каждого, но не для него.* [...] having right to life almost for anyone, but not **for him**. BENEFICIARY
[...], *mających prawo do istnienia prawie u każdego człowieka, tylko nie u niego.* [...] having the right to existence almost **at/by every person**, only not **at/by him**.

Николай Островский. Как закалялась сталь (ч. 2) (1930-1934), Nikolaј Ostrowski. Jak hartowała się stal (cz 2) (Wacław Rogowicz, 1954)

- 119) *Об этом Атаназию когда-то рассказал сам Препудрех в приступе необычной для него искренности.* About this Atanaziu someday spoke himself Prepuđrech in a fit unusual **for him** sincerity. IUDICANTIS
Mówił o tym Atanazemu kiedyś sam Prepuđrech w przystępie nienormalnej u niego szczerości. He spoke about this Atanazem someday himself Prepuđrech in a fit of unusual **at/by him** sincerity.

Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz. Pożegnanie jesieni (1925), Станислав Игнацы Виткевич. Прощание с осенью (Ю. Чайников, 2006)

- 120) *Неизвестно, сколько рентабельных для эксплуатации месторождений сланцевого газа есть в Польше.* It is not known how much profitable **for the exploitation** of the deposits of shale gas is in Poland. PURPOSE
Nie wiadomo, ile opłacalnych w eksploatacji złóż gazu łupkowego jest w Polsce. It is not known how much profitable **in the exploitation** of the deposits of shale gas is in Poland.

Andrzej Kublik. W Polsce trwa gorączka gazu łupkowego, a Rosja boi się łupków (Gazeta Wyborcza) (17.12.2010), Анжей Кублик. В Польше продолжается лихорадка сланцевого газа, а Россия его боится (Газета Выборча, 2010.12.17)

- 121) *В конце концов, не время и не место сейчас для теологических дискуссий.* After all, no time and no place now **for theological debate**. PURPOSE
Nie miejsce zresztą i nie czas na dysputę teologiczną. No place anyway and no time **towards theological dispute**.

Andrzej Sapkowski. Lux Perpetua (1) (2006), Анджей Сапковский. Свет вечный (1) (В. Фляк, 2009)

- 122) *Художник не пожалел для святых близнецов ни краски ни позолоты, [...] The artist didn't spare for the saint twins neither paint, nor gilding [...] BENEFICIARY*
Artysta nie pożałował na świętych bliźniaków farby ni ni pozłoty [...] The artist didn't spare towards the saint twins neither paint nor the gilding [...]

Andrzej Sapkowski. Lux Perpetua (1) (2006), Анджей Сапковский. Свет вечный (1) (В. Фляк, 2009)

- 123) *Это была бы вода на мельницу Люксембуржца, новый повод для поклепов крестоносцев.* This would be water to the mill of Luxembourg, new cause **for slander of Crusaders**. PURPOSE
Byłaby to woda na młyn Luksemburczyka, nowy pretekst do krzyżackich oszczerstw. This would be water to the mill of Luxembourg, new pretext **towards Teutonic slander**.

Andrzej Sapkowski. Lux Perpetua (2) (2006), Анджей Сапковский. Свет вечный (2) (В. Фляк, 2009)

- 124) *[...] поставлял темы для проповедей прямо-таки в ужасающем темпе. [...] provided topics for sermons downright in the terrible temple. PURPOSE*
[...] dostarczał tematów do kazania w zastraszającym wręcz tempie. [...] provided topics towards sermons in the intimidating almost temple.

Andrzej Sapkowski. Boży bojownicy (1) (2004), Анджей Сапковский. Божьи воины (1) (Е. Вайсброт, 2006)

- 125) *[...] сырьем для создания голема послужили глина, ил и тина, взятые со дна Влтавы. [...] raw materials for the creation of golem served clay, slime, taken from the deep of the Vitova. PURPOSE*
[...] za surowiec do wytworzenia голема posłużyły glina, szlam i mul pobrane z dna Włtawy. [...] for raw materials towards the production of golem were used clay, sludge and mule taken from under the Vitova.

Andrzej Sapkowski. Boży bojownicy (1) (2004), Анджей Сапковский. Божьи воины (1) (Е. Вайсброт, 2006)

- 126) *[...], зато получив еще один повод для мести. [...] but after receiving one more reason for revenge. PURPOSE*
[...], ale za to wyposażony w jeszcze jeden powód do zemsty. [...], but for that equipped with one more reason towards revenge.

Andrzej Sapkowski. Boży bojownicy (2) (2004), Анджей Сапковский. Божьи воины (2) (Е. Вайсброт, 2006)

- 127) *Но не время для диспутов.* But no time **for dispute**. PURPOSE
Ale nie czas na dysputy. But no time **towards dispute**.

Andrzej Sapkowski. *Boży bojownicy* (2) (2004), Анджей Сапковский. *Божьи войны* (2) (Е. Вайсброт, 2006)

- 128) [...] *не тема для обсуждения*. [...] (is) not topic **for debate**. PURPOSE
[...] *to żaden temat do debat*. [...] this no topic **towards debate**.

Andrzej Sapkowski. *Narrenturm* (1) (2002), Анджей Сапковский. *Башня шутов* (1) (Е. Вайсброт, 2004)

- 129) [...], *с одной дыркой для кормежки и другой как раз напротив, так чтобы он даже почесаться не мог*. [...] with one hole **for feeding** and the second exactly on the contrary, so that he even scratch couldn't. PURPOSE
[...] *z jedną dziurą na pokarm i drugą na wprost przeciwnie, tak, by nawet podrapać się nie zdołał*. [...] with one hole **towards feeding** and the second straight ahead on the contrary, so that even scratch he didn't manage.

Andrzej Sapkowski. *Narrenturm* (1) (2002), Анджей Сапковский. *Башня шутов* (1) (Е. Вайсброт, 2004)

- 130) *Для шпики слишком хороши*, [...] **For spy** too good PURPOSE
Na szpiega za ładny [...] **Towards spy** too pretty [...]

Andrzej Sapkowski. *Narrenturm* (1) (2002), Анджей Сапковский. *Башня шутов* (1) (Е. Вайсброт, 2004)

- 131) *Изнасилование опольской жительницы – это, на мой взгляд, серьезное преступление. Слишком тяжелое для быстрой смерти*. Violence on Opole residents – this, in my opinion, (is) a serious crime. Too hard **for quick death**. PURPOSE
Gwałt na opolskiej mieszcze to zatem w moich oczach bardzo ciężka zbrodnia. Zbyt ciężka na szybką śmierć. Violence on Opole residents that (is) therefore to my eyes a very hard crime. Too hard **towards quick death**.

Andrzej Sapkowski. *Narrenturm* (1) (2002), Анджей Сапковский. *Башня шутов* (1) (Е. Вайсброт, 2004)

- 132) [...] *если его задержание необходимо для обеспечения правильного хода судебного делопроизводства*. [...] if his detention should be **for ensuring** of the proper course of the court. PURPOSE
[...] *i jeżeli jego zatrzymanie jest niezbędne do zapewnienia prawidłowego toku postępowania*. [...] and if his detention is necessary **towards ensuring** of the proper course of the procedure.

Ustawa o Najwyższej Izbie Kontroli (1995), Закон о Верховной Контрольной Палате (2000-2010)

- 133) [...], *кроме того, который был естественен для всякого читателя*. [...], furthermore, which was natural **for every reader**. IUDICANTIS
[...] *niczego ponad to, co naturalne u każdego czytelnika*. [...], furthermore, something natural **at/by each reader**.

Гайто Газданов. *Призрак Александра Вольфа* (1947), Gajto Gazdanow. *Widmo Aleksandra Wolfa* (Henryk Chłystowski, 2009)

BENEFICIARY: 5 CASES

PURPOSE: 12 CASES

IUDICANTIS: 6 CASES

Do = 8 cases; przeze = 1 case; na = 8 cases; u = 5 cases; w = 1 case

8. Bibliography

- Апресян, Юрий Дереникович (Apresjan, Jurij Derenikovič). 1995. Ради и для: сходства и различия (Radi i dlja: schodstva i različja). In *Вопросы языкознания (Voprosy jazykonanija)*. №3: 17-27.
- Апресян, Валентина, и Летучий, Александр (Apresjan, Valentina, and Letuchiy, Alexander). 2023. Конкуренция дательного падежа и предлога для при глаголах и предикативах в русском языке: семантика и синтаксис (Konkurencija datel'novogo padeža i predloga dlja glagolach i predikativach v russkom jazike: semantika i sintaksis). In *Russian Linguistics*: 167-207.
- Астафьева, Нина Ивановна (Astaf'eva, Nina Ivanovna). 1974. *Предлоги в русском языке и особенности их употребления (Predlogi v russkom jazike i osobennosti ich upotreblenija)*. Минск: Издательство “Вышэйшая школа” (Minsk: Izdatel'stvo “Vyshèishaja škola”).
- Bartnicka, Barbara, et al. 2004. *Grammatik des Polnischen*. München: Otto Sagner.
- Biskup, Petr. 2017. Decomposing Prepositional Cases in Russian and Polish. In Olav Mueller Reichau & Marcel Guhl (eds). *Aspects of Slavic Linguistics*. Berlin: De Gruyter: 50-68.
- Butt, Miriam Jessica. 2012. Modern Approaches to Cases: an Overview. In Andrej L. Malchukov, & Andrew Spencer (eds). *Handbook of Case*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 27-43.
- Cantarini, Aldo. 1999. Le lingue slave. In Emanuele Banfi (ed). *La formazione dell'Europa Linguistica*. Milano: La Nuova Italia: 145-196.
- Cadorin, Elisa, and Kukushkina, Irina. 2016. *Kak dela? Corso di Lingua Russa*. Milano: Ulrico Hoepli.

- Comrie, Bernard. 1989. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Dąbrowska, Ewa. 1997. *Cognitive Semantics and the Polish Dative*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter
- Fauconnier, Gilles. 1994. *Mental Spaces: Aspects of Meaning Construction in Natural Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gaeta, Livio, and Luraghi, Silvia (ed.). 2003. *Introduzione alla Linguistica Cognitiva*. Roma: Carocci.
- Gančikov, Anjuta. 2004. *Grammatica russa facile*. Milano: Avallardi.
- Gawroński, Andrzej. 1922. O przymku *dla* w dzisiejszej polszczyźnie. In *Język Polski*, Styczeń, Luty 1922: 1-12.
- Giora, Rachel. 1997. Understanding Figurative and Literal Language: The Graded Salience Hypothesis. In *Cognitive Linguistics*: 183-206.
- Goddard, Cliff, and Wierzbicka, Anna. 2011. Semantics and cognition. In *Wiley interdisciplinary reviews. Cognitive science*. Volume 2, Issue 2: 125-135.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2006. Terminology of Case. In Andrej L. Malchukov, & Andrew Spencer (eds). *Handbook of Case*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 505–517.
- Kahneman, Daniel. 2011. *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. London: Penguin.
- Kovács, Éva. 2011. Polysemy in Traditional vs. Cognitive Linguistics. In *Eger Journal of English Studies XI*: 3-19.
- Janda, Laura A. 1993. *A Geography of Case Semantics. The Czech Dative and the Russian Instrumental*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lakoff, George, and Johnson, Mark. 1980. *Metaphors we live by*. Cambridge/London: University of Chicago Press.

- Левонтина, Ирина Борисовна (Levontina, Irina Borisovna). 2003. Для (Dlja). In Апресян, Юрий Дереникович (Apresjan, Jurij Derenikovič) (ed). *Новый объяснительный словарь синонимов русского языка (Novyj ob'jasitel'nyj slovar' sinonimov russkovo jazyka)*. Москва: Школа “языки славянской культуры” (Moscow: Škola “jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury”): 272-280.
- Лозбэ, М (Lozbe, M). 1965. *Из истории причинных и целевых отношении. Эволюция синтетического употребления послелога дьля - предлога для в русском языке (Iz istorii pričinnyh i celevykh otnoshenii. Evoljucija sintetičeskogo upotreblenija posleloga dьla – predloga dlja v russkom jazyke)*. Москва: Издательство московского университета (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo moskovskogo universiteta).
- Luraghi, Silvia. 2021. *Introduzione alla Linguistica Storica*. Roma: Carocci.
- Mazur, Bolesław. 2011. *Colloquial Polish. The Complete Course for Beginners*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Muller, Charles M. 2016. A Semantic Account of the English Preposition FOR based on a Cognitive Linguistics Framework. In *The Bulletin of the Faculty of Humanities*, 53: 1- 24.
- Rice, Sally. 1996. Prepositional prototypes. In Martin Pütz & René Dirven (eds). *The Construal of Space in Language and Thought*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter: 135-166.
- Rosch, Eleanor H. 1973. Natural categories. In *Cognitive Psychology* 4 (3): 328–350
- Šarić, Ljiljana. 2001. Prepositional categories and prototypes: Contrasting some Russian, Slovenian, Croatian and Polish examples. In *The Slavic and East European Language Resource Center, Issue 1, Spring 2001*: 1-20.
- Sołtysiak, Arkadiusz. 2005. Zanik Celownika w Języku Polskim. In *The Peculiarity of Man. Vol. 10, 2005*: 205-211.
- Sosnowski, Wojciech. 2015. Analytic tendencies in modern Polish and Russian. In *Cognitive Studies*: 97-108.

- Sussex, Roland, and Cubberley, Paul. 2006. *The Slavic Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Švédova, N.Ju., et al. 1980. *русская грамматика (Russkaja grammatika)*. Москва: наука (Moscow: Nauka).
- Taylor, John R. 1993. Prepositions: patterns of polysemization and strategies of disambiguation. In Zelinsky-Wibbelt, Cornelia (ed). *The Semantics of Prepositions. From Mental Processing to Natural Language Processing*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter: 151-178.
- Zakharov, Victor. 2013. Corpora of the Russian Language. In *International Conference on Text, Speech and Dialogue*. Berlin: Springer: 151:178.
- Zieliński, Andrzej, and Bertone, Giuliana. 2010. *Polacco. Grammatica essenziale*. Milano: Avallardi.